

Four Corners Power Plant and  
Navajo Mine Energy Project  
FEIS

APPENDIX

F

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES  
508 COMPLIANT MATRIX

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1.001	Mr.	Frank	Etcitty		4/2/2014	Before Navajo Mine or Billiton moves out of our Jurisdiction of our Beautiful Navajo Land, they need to do the Reclaim or Recovery Relining the ASH they putted back in years and years ago. This is causing the Environmental Pollution, underground water pollution and seeping to our Live Stocks, Grazing Land and our Corn field, Water Melon patches and etc.	Thank you for your comment. Reclamation of mining areas is a required aspect of all SMCRA permits. A summary of proposed reclamation activities is provided in Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft EIS. Similarly, reclamation of the FCPP area is part of the lease agreement between APS and that Navajo Nation. Section 3.2.5.2 provides a list of reclamation actions that must be conducted per the lease agreement.
2.001	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	Western Environmental Law Center	4/7/2014	The Western Environmental Law Center, on behalf of San Juan Citizens Alliance, Diné Citizens Against Ruining our Environment, Center for Biological Diversity, Amigos Bravos, WildEarth Guardians, and Sierra Club (collectively "Conservation Groups"), requests an extension to the deadline for comments on the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine Project of 60 days, up to and including July 25, 2014.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
2.002	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	Western Environmental Law Center	4/7/2014	In addition, we request that the public meetings be pushed back so that the public has an opportunity to review and digest the draft EIS before attending a meeting. OSM notes that the meetings will present an opportunity to ask questions about the project and provide comments. In order to make those meetings meaningful, members of the public need adequate time to consider the draft EIS.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
2.003	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	Western Environmental Law Center	4/7/2014	We therefore respectfully request that OSM extend the comment deadline 60 days to July 25, 2014, and push the meetings back accordingly.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
3.001	Mr.	Michael	Kelley	San Juan Reproduction	4/7/2014	BHP Billiton, APS-Four Corners Power Plant, and Navajo Mine have been staples of the economy in San Juan County for many years. Businesses like mine would find it extremely painful to lose the revenue provided by any/all of these entities. Additionally, these companies pay high, competitive salaries that are the main support for many families in our area. It is for these reasons that I would ask that you do everything in your power to help NTEC (Navajo Transitional Energy Company) to secure the necessary approvals to operate Navajo Mine beyond 2016.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
4.001	Ms.	Kate	Niles		4/13/2014	I tried the link given on the postcard I received to view the draft EIS, only to be told there was no such page. I then searched your website and didn't find it either.	OSMRE has confirmed that the link provided on the public meeting materials is accurate and functioning properly.
4.002	Ms.	Kate	Niles		4/13/2014	Why extend the lease when DINE CARE and others have come up with an alternative energy plan (wind and solar) that would give Navajos jobs and not pollute their sheep, children, grandmothers, men, women, horses, sagebrush, soil, cows, dogs, ad nauseum? Has no one any other vision?	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
5.001	Mr.	Mickie	Ashbaker	Fenner Dunlop Conveyor Services	4/14/2014	APS, NTEC, and BHPB provide a major part of the economy in this and the surrounding areas. I believe if the lease is not approved there would be an economic disaster, displacing many individuals, families, and businesses. Not only are APS, NTEC, and BHPB and integral part of the area, the service they provide to supply power to 1000's of people is pertinent.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
6.001	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley	Dine Citizens Against Ruining Our Environment	4/15/2014	On behalf of Diné people, Diné Citizens Against Ruining Our Environment (Diné C.A.R.E.) respectfully requests for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. In addition, Diné C.A.R.E. requests for the draft EIS to be translated in its entirety into the Navajo language. The draft EIS is extensive and it will require more time for an average person to read and comprehend the entire document. 60 days is not a sufficient amount of time to read through a 1500 page document and to provide thorough comments. In addition, the impacted areas are made up primarily of Diné people, elders who do not understand English very well. Although, we are aware of OSM's commitment to have Navajo interpreters at the upcoming public meetings on the Navajo Nation, we are requesting for the entire draft EIS document to be translated into the Navajo language. When documents and presentations are presented in the Navajo language, it is communicated and comprehended more effectively for the Navajo speaking public. Therefore, we respectfully request for the OSM to extend the comment period for an additional 60 days to end on July 26, 2014 and to translate the entire draft EIS into the Navajo language.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period.
7.001	Mr.	Greg	Gummersall		4/15/2014	The plants should not be operated without their being in full physical compliance with the strictest supervision that is based on their not polluting at all.	Thank you for your comment. A discussion of the rules and regulations applicable to the FCPP and Navajo Mine operation is provided in the beginning of each resource area section within Chapter 4. In addition, a summary of the regulatory agencies with oversight over one or more aspect of the project is provided in Section 1.
8.001	Mr.	Vincent	Yazzie		4/16/2014	Two Federal actions were completed prior to the Draft EIS: OSM's approval of a SMCRA permit transfer associated with the equity sale and merger of Navajo Mine Coal Company (NMCC) with the Navajo Transitional Energy Company (NTEC), including all assets formerly held by BNCC, and the US Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) issuance of a Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) for the installation of Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART) at the FCPP. These completed actions are not considered part of the Proposed Action, but part of the environmental baseline. The changes to the pre- 2014 baseline as a result of these actions are described in this EIS as the Interim Period (2014 to 2018). Page 2, Executive Summary, Volume 1 The existing permit for the Navajo Mine, includes coal resource Areas I, II, III, and portions of Area IV North within the Navajo Mine Lease Area (Federal SMCRA Permit NM0003F). It is administered on a 5- year renewal schedule (30 USC 1256, 30 CFR 773.19) with the current permit term	Thank you for your comment. This is an accurate summary. There is no double-negative in the referenced regulations.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p>expiring on September 25, 2014. Considering that the permit term will expire prior to OSMRE's anticipated completion of the EIS and prior to the currently expected March 2015 Record of Decision (ROD), OSMRE will administratively extend Federal Permit NM0003F allowing NTEC to continue surface coal mining and reclamation operations under the current permit, provided that the applicant has met all renewal application requirements and procedures in accordance with 30 CFR 750.12(c)(1)(ii) and 774.15(a). Upon completion of the EIS, the subsequent issuance of the ROD for the pending Pinabete Permit Application will also address OSMRE's decision on the administratively delayed and pending permit term renewal for Federal Permit NM0003F.</p> <p>Is this a double negative? 30 CFR 774.15(a) says stay inside the boundary, but 30 CFR 750.12(c)(1)(ii) points back to 30 CFR 774 which incorporates 774.17 too.</p> <p>30 CFR 750.12</p> <p>§ 750.12 Permit applications.</p> <p>(a) Each application for a permit to conduct surface coal mining operations on lands subject to this part shall be accompanied by fees in accordance with § 750.25 of this part.</p> <p>(b) Unless specified otherwise by the regulatory authority, each person submitting a permit application shall file no less than seven copies of the complete permit application package with OSM. OSM will ensure that the affected tribes, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and when applicable, the Bureau of Land Management receive copies of the application.</p> <p>(c)(1) The following requirements of subchapter G of this chapter shall govern the processing of permit applications on Indian lands except as specified in paragraph (c)(2) or (c)(3) of this section.</p> <p>(i) Part 773;</p> <p>(ii) Part 774;</p>	
9.001	Ms.	Sarah Jane	White		4/14/2014	I also request for a 60-day comment extension because there is no way I can read 800 plus pages by the time the EIS Meetings starts on April 30, 2014. This review is covering over 45 years of mining operations and I need more time to digest the document.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period.
10.001	Mr.	Rodney	Brown		4/19/2014	I have lived a very comfortable life because of my father's financial earnings. I support the continued operation of the Four Corners Power Plant, because countless people will be affected by a potential plant shutdown. Employees and their immediate family members are the obvious stakeholders, but regional businesses and industries will suffer financially.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
10.002	Mr.	Rodney	Brown		4/19/2014	My father tells me that the Plant is actively reducing its pollution outputs. The Plant already shutdown pollution-heavy operations, equipment and facilities. The pollution created by the Four Corners Power Plant has always been a downside of its operations. But, the Plant is finding more ways to reduce its pollution levels, and that is noble.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of the air emissions of the FCPP is provided in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 of the Draft EIS
10.003	Mr.	Rodney	Brown		4/19/2014	Our local economy will grow and flourish. Non-profit organizations, like United Way, will continue to receive monetary support from the Plant.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
11.001	Mr.	Fred	Myron		4/30/2014	Basically I just had concerns with, you know, the artifacts, if they have found, you know, some artifacts in that general area, the lease area, how would you be able to get information regarding that. I guess, you know, if they are really documenting, you know, I guess, regarding, you know, aboriginal occupancy and if these items are going to be returned back to the original tribes that they're linked to. Or is there a process that one has to go through to get, you know, ownership of that, I guess is what I'm kind of thinking of. Is there a process of doing that. Especially original occupants part that I'm kind of wondering about, you know, because of past conflicts and so forth.	Two programmatic agreements have been developed for the project to address the protection of cultural resources and artifacts. A discussion of the tribal and Section 106 consultation processes through which these programmatic agreements were developed is provided in Section 4.4, Cultural Resources. In addition, a complete summary of all consultation activities to date is provided in Section 5, Consultation and Coordination.
11.002	Mr.	Fred	Myron		4/30/2014	You know, I've got a lot of that information with some of the stacks being closed because, you know, they need to be -- you know, I guess the BART or whatever because whichever that one was where they had to reduce the emissions, you know, and to what effect these emissions would reduce pollution. And there is different categories, I guess, but how well would you be able to reduce pollution that is emitted by the generator.	A description of the Final Implementation Plan and BART decision for FCPP is provided in Section 3.2.1.2 in the Draft EIS. A complete discussion of the change in emissions as a result of the BART decision is provided in Section 4.1.3. In addition, each resource area section describes any changes in existing setting which have resulted from the BART decision.
12.001	Mr.	Marshall	Johnson		4/30/2014	they didn't add into their equation the value of, say, the groundwater and the surface water and the land, the vegetation, and the air into the equation of continuing to mine, to desecrate the land, the groundwater and the surface water from the contaminants, say the coal ash, diluting into the surface water and flowing downstream. And then you got the power plant that will be spewing out pollution and then desecrating the air for the health -- to harm again another 25 years, I think is the timeline on this project.	The Draft EIS evaluates potential impacts to groundwater and surface water in Section 4.5, land use in Section 4.9, vegetation in 4.6, and air quality in Section 4.1. The Environmental Justice analysis contains a comprehensive discussion of potential effects to the Navajo Nation, which is recognized as an Environmental Justice population (i.e. minority population) in Section 4.11. Potential environmental justice effects to human health are founded on the findings of Section 4.1 (Air Quality), Section 4.17 (Health and Safety), and references cited therein.
12.002	Mr.	Marshall	Johnson		4/30/2014	It's time and it's affordable to transition to renewable energy.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives.
13.001	Mr.	William	Hendrickson		5/1/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
14.001	Mr.	Bill	Jobin		5/1/2014	I'm appalled by the deficiencies in it, especially regarding the health aspects of the soot and other emissions from the burning coal. These particles of soot and the extra fine ones are extremely dangerous for health, and I can see them every day from my front window coming up the valley..... And so the EIS should be rejected until they do a health impact assessment.	Page 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarizes the results of the Human Health Risk Assessment performed for the Project. In addition, the results of the health risk assessment addressing emissions from the Navajo Mine is included on pages 4.17-19 through 4.17-21. The health study included consideration of fugitive dust, diesel particulate matter from diesel-fired equipment, and references regional health studies completed by New Mexico Environment Department and others.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
14.002	Mr.	Bill	Jobin		5/1/2014	Furthermore, two days ago, the Supreme Court ruled that states were responsible for pollution across state lines from these power plants in a ruling that -- the New England states filed a suit against the Great Lakes states, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana and Illinois, and claimed that they were damaging the health of the people in New England. The Supreme Court ruled in favor of the New England states and require now that the middle western states are going to have to put in stringent controls on these smokestack emissions.	The Supreme Court decision occurred after publication of the Draft EIS. A summary of the decision and its applicability to the proposed Project has been added to Section 4.1 of the Final EIS.
15.001	Mr.	Johnson	Brown		5/2/2014	And it gave me financial stability there as a Navajo, as a Native American Navajo Indian. And I had the opportunity to raise my kids with my work. I've been able to send them to college and they're on their own now.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
16.001	Mr.	Mike	Eisenfeld	San Juan Citizens Alliance	5/2/2014	I just want to make a formal complaint about the comment period. We've been told that OSM will determine if the comment period will be extended beyond May 26th after the public hearings which end on May 9th. It's an extensive document with numerous actions, with numerous different agencies that have responsibilities and regulatory authority.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period.
16.002	Mr.	Mike	Eisenfeld	San Juan Citizens Alliance	5/2/2014	And here tonight there's nobody from the Environmental Protection Agency who has a very significant role on air issues and climate change issues. And we're told that the EPA is not expected at any of these public meetings. Why aren't they here? We also want to know why the Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance is absent when they have a role in assisting with compliance of NEPA and other applicable federal laws.	OSMRE extended a request to participate in the public comment meetings to the EPA and all other cooperating agencies for the project. Accordingly, representatives from US Army Corps of Engineers, BIA, and the Navajo Nation were present at most meetings.
17.001	Ms.	Mary	Karraker		5/3/2014	But because we cannot put a fence around a national park and keep the air clean, then we all suffer from the pollution caused by power plants in the Four Corners area.	Thank you for your comment. The National Park Service is a cooperating agency for the project with specific interest in evaluating potential impacts to nearby national parks. A discussion of potential visibility impacts to Class I receptors is provided in Section 4.1, Air Quality, beginning on page 4.1-96.
17.002	Ms.	Mary	Karraker		5/3/2014	And I have serious concerns about the weakening of environmental controls.	Thank you for your comment. Under all alternatives analyzed, the facilities under evaluation would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and tribal laws and regulations. A discussion of applicable laws, regulations, and standards is provided in the Regulatory Compliance Framework subsection of each resource area section in Chapter 4.
18.001	Mr.	Paul	Senecal		5/3/2014	Well, my comment, which was obvious after I looked at the displays, is that I talked to several of the presenters and that there was no information on the history of the environmental damage over the course of when they were first built and this one power plant was built in '62. And I know since '62 through the present time, there's been a lot of damage to the environment.	The discussion of the environmental baseline includes consideration of environmental effects. For example, soil sampling, groundwater sampling, and inspections consider the integrated effects of past activities. See also Master Response #14, Baseline.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
19.001	Ms.	Stephanie	Dressen		5/3/2014	And I believe my leaders, the Navajo Nation, are not working with the people or the environment and they're in favor of making something bad down the road in favor of jobs for people right now. And I just don't think that is going to work out because it's only going to be a short-term solution for a long-term problem.	Thank you for your comment. The Navajo Nation is a cooperating agency for this project and is working closely with OSMRE and the other cooperating agencies to evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed project and alternatives. The Draft EIS provides analysis that supports consideration of short-term and long-term impacts and benefits. The intent of the EIS is to provide this information to decision-makers as a guide to the environmental consequences of their decisions.
19.002	Ms.	Stephanie	Dressen		5/3/2014	My home is being contaminated by these mines with the air. My home is not -- is changing because of what is happening, the air quality, and you're seeing the ramification of climate change. We need to focus on looking at the future with renewable resources and we need to look to try to change what we have to better what is happening, and the mine is not help that.	An evaluation of the potential air quality impacts of the proposed action and alternatives is provided in Section 4.1, Air Quality of the Draft EIS. In addition, a human health risk assessment of the emissions from the Navajo Mine is located on pages 4.17-19 through 4.17-22 of the Draft EIS. With regard to renewable resources, please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives. With regard to climate change, both section 4.2 and Section 4.18 address the impacts of the project to climate change, including multi-media effects.
20.001	Mr.	Mike	Eisenfeld	San Juan Citizens Alliance	5/3/2014	A glaring deficiency of these public meetings is EPA's failure to be here. Without meaningful interaction between the public and EPA over this draft Environmental Impact Statement, the public is restricted from having the ability to interact with the people who are making decisions associated with things like a massive amount of greenhouse gas emissions at the time when the federal government is talking about the environmental catastrophe of continuing business as usual with greenhouse gas emissions and coal facilities. Our organization remains very concerned that EPA is minimizing the responsibilities to craft the future for the Four Corners region, and we formally protest EPA's failure to be here during any of these public meetings.	OSMRE extended a request to participate in the public comment meetings to the EPA and all other cooperating agencies for the project. Accordingly, representatives from US Army Corps of Engineers, BIA, and the Navajo Nation were present at most meetings.
21.001	Ms.	Theresa	Anderson		5/5/2014	It's going to hurt the economy. We are working on projects to help get plants be cleaner. The two units that we have meet the requirements right now. I feel it's going to hurt our county if we close it. And I say that. We employ -- we have 414 employees. BHP probably has something similar to that. And it's just going to be bad for the economy in Farmington.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
22.001	Mr.	Erickson	Benally		5/5/2014	I just wanted to tell you about the benefits it's provided for me and my family	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
22.002	Mr.	Erickson	Benally		5/5/2014	So I'm supporting the Navajo Nation, BHP and the tribe, NTEC and Arizona Public Service because it feeds my family every day.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
23.001	Mr.	Thomas	Martin		5/5/2014	There's good paying jobs out there, and I think it benefits the community.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
24.001	Ms.	Eileen	Lujan		5/5/2014	My concern is the rough road that we have to travel on, the washboard area. I think the road should be paved and well maintained. Once the pavement is in, they need to -- somebody has to be -- the maintenance should go along. Once they get the easement, they should maintain the road to it, because sometimes they put in the road and they don't maintain it after that.	The Navajo Nation is responsible for road construction requirements.
24.002	Ms.	Eileen	Lujan		5/5/2014	The right-of-way should be fenced off on the east side going south because we get -- where Mom lives on the east side of that right-of-way, we get intruders from the west side to get to the areas. We have -- Mom has a grazing permit and they have livestock there. She has livestock there. So I think the fence should be there and not -- to be -- well, not just for anybody to leave the road there. It should be fenced or something, not to go east, leaving the area.	Thank you for your comment. Fencing is not proposed as part of the project, and the project does not cause the cited effects.
24.003	Ms.	Eileen	Lujan		5/5/2014	And then the air pollution I think really needs to be taken care of. They always say -- we're told, yeah, it's going to be taken care of. I just want them to keep their word. We want better air, cleaner air, plus the cleaner water.	The potential environmental impacts with regard to air quality and water resources is provided in Sections 4.1 and 4.5 of the Draft EIS, respectively.
25.001	Ms.	Rochelle	Benally		5/5/2014	And I think the plant and the mines are beneficial to the community. They're one of the biggest assets that the Navajo Nation has, and I think that if we didn't get favorable outcome, I think that we would -- it would be detrimental to the committee in the area.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
25.002	Ms.	Rochelle	Benally		5/5/2014	some of the community members don't have heating, proper heating systems in their homes, and so they rely on the mine during the winter times and they use the coal from that to heat their homes in the winter. And there is a lot of those families out there that don't have, you know, heating systems or, you know, electric furnaces or any of that stuff in the area. So they rely on some of that. And I think if we did away with the plant and the mine, it would do away with a lot of jobs. We're going to end up losing a lot, you know, in this committee and also the Navajo Nation.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
26.001	Mr.	Reginald	Young		5/5/2014	I personally feel that we should keep our power plants and our coal mines going, number one, because I work in that field and I've been making a living off of that to support my family;	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
27.001	Mr.	Andrew	Johnson		5/5/2014	I would also like the discussion to continue about the type of technology used under the BART proposed ruling. I believe San Juan generating station uses or they've been allowed to use a different type, a less expensive type, of catalytic reduction or selective catalytic reduction. And I think since these two power plants exist in the same vicinity, that we should -- that APS should be given the same consideration to use that technology.	Thank you for your comment. The Federal Implementation Plan for BART at FCPP was established by EPA in 2012, and the selection of technology was a business decision by the owners of the FCPP. The selected technology is part of the baseline of this EIS, and the long-term consequences of that decision are analyzed in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
28.001	Ms.	Connie	Falk		5/5/2014	I think it's really important to examine clean energy alternatives and in that process to accurately estimate all of the costs involved and all of the alternatives. And the costs to future generations of coal mining need to be taken into consideration.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives.
28.002	Ms.	Connie	Falk		5/5/2014	And this is the most crucial period in history that we have to do something to mitigate climate change. And I also know that wind and solar are competitive with coal mining. And if they have any evidence to the contrary, then there is something wrong with their analysis and they need to reconsider that analysis.	Thank you for your comment. Climate Change is addressed in Section 4.2 of the Draft EIS, as well as in Section 4.18, Cumulative Impacts. With regard to renewable energy alternatives, please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives.
29.001	Mr.	Rick	Hatfield		5/5/2014	But my concern is that it feels like there was an agenda to the presentation here and that it focused on the positives and didn't clarify the costs and the downside.	Thank you for your comment. The public meetings were conducted in accordance with CEQ NEPA Regulations and the OSMRE NEPA Handbook.
29.002	Mr.	Rick	Hatfield		5/5/2014	You know, to be told that it's having no health impact is, in my mind, ludicrous and makes me distrust the system and the way they went about it, if they came to that conclusion.	Thank you for your comment. Pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarizes the results of the Human Health Risk Assessment performed for the Project. In addition, a discussion of the results of human health risk assessment evaluating potential impacts of the emissions from the Navajo Mine is located on pages 4.17-19 through 4.17-22 of the Draft EIS.
30.001	Mr.	Gilbert	Manygoats		5/5/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comments.
31.001	Ms.	Tiffany	Segay		5/5/2014	And the reason why, you know -- or one of my biggest concern was because, you know, my dad is currently employed at Four Corners power plant and I feel like it's good because it helps the area as far as employees.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
32.001	Ms.	Sarah	White		5/6/2014	We need water studies. We need to have it done on the San Juan River as well as the wells around the Navajo mine and the parkland. The reason is because of the coal combustion waste. They say here on the board that the fly ash, the coal combustion waste are lime, and they dispose of the ash on the lime ponds.	The potential effects of flyash disposal at FCPP and placement at the Navajo Mine are discussed in the EIS. Section 4.5 of the Draft EIS describes the potential environmental impacts of the proposed action and alternatives with regard to surface water and groundwater quantity and quality. Data used in conducting the analysis includes groundwater monitoring and surface water monitoring data collected by BNCC, APS, and the Navajo Nation.
32.002	Ms.	Sarah	White		5/6/2014	I have a concern about climate change.... I don't know if other people realize it, but the weather is pretty bad. And so that's another thing. And all that caused by uranium oil and gas, power plants, coal power plants, coal ash, coal dust.	Climate change is addressed in Section 4.2 of the Draft EIS. Cumulative impacts of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions are addressed in Section 4.18 of the Draft EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
32.003	Ms.	Sarah	White		5/6/2014	The health goes hand in hand with climate change to me.... And so the health impact is very bad in Four Corners. I know a lot of people are very sick, some of them very sick with heart disease, respiratory problems, asthma. That goes with all kinds of different respiratory problems....The power plant, the smoke, the pollution has a lot to do with that, too, because we breathe it every day, every night....So what I'm requesting through this EIS is we would like to have a health study. We have not had -- we've been asking for a health study for the last 10 years, and what the Office of Surface Mining told us is that they did a health study, a health study that they did in-house with people that burn coal in the wood stove and they did find a lot of pollution inside the house, of course. Of course, there would be.	Pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarizes the results of the Human Health Risk Assessment performed for the Project. In addition, a discussion of the results of human health risk assessment evaluating potential impacts of the emissions from the Navajo Mine is located on pages 4.17-19 through 4.17-22 of the Draft EIS. The health study also includes quantification of the effects of fugitive dust, diesel particulate matter, and reference to public health evaluations of the area by New Mexico Environment Department and others.
32.004	Ms.	Sarah	White		5/6/2014	Another thing that is my concern is that all those posters that are out there has a lot to do with the comments that we put from the scoping meeting, and that's what it is. And then the book is about that big. It's 1,500 pages. Nobody is going to read all that in less than a month. Like me, I just got mine last week. There's no way I'm going to read it in less than a month, read it and then able to understand it because it has a lot of some of these -- they're written in more like real legal, and a lot of it I can't understand. I had to read them like two or three times in order for me to comprehend what it's talking about. And there are -- a lot of people are like that. And so it is hard to understand them.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period. OSMRE provided the information in the EIS in a variety of formats, including posterboards, experts available for question and answer (with translators if needed), and a video that summarized the contents of the Draft EIS in words and graphics.
32.005	Ms.	Sarah	White		5/6/2014	We're talking about herbal. The Native American people, the Navajos, they live off the land. They use herbal medicine. I use herbal medicine. A lot of people that use herbal medicines are dying out in this area. We collect these vegetables in the springtime, like wild onions and parsley and wild carrots and they're good and you can cook with them. They're seasonings. That's how I season my food. I have a jar of parsley like that that I collected about five years ago. I'm really preserving it and I still have some of it. And we're talking about all these medicine, herbs that has been growing out in the area of the BHP and the Four Corners power plant. All these, they need to be carefully studied.	Plants collected for food, medicine, ceremonies, and other traditional uses, are defined as Traditional Cultural Lifeway/Resources in the Draft EIS (Glossary, p.7-9). These resources are addressed in Section 4.4.2.4 in regards to traditional use and traditional cultural properties and described in confidential reports. Additionally, the Navajo Nation and Hopi have provided information regarding the species that the Tribes rely on for subsistence.
33.001	Ms.	Annie	Walker		5/6/2014	Well, my concern is the health issue, related to health issues.....And so I said ask the power plant to monitor your health at their expense and not with power plant doctors, somebody else.	Pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarizes the results of the Human Health Risk Assessment performed for the Project. In addition, a discussion of the results of human health risk assessment evaluating potential impacts of the emissions from the Navajo Mine is located on pages 4.17-19 through 4.17-22 of the Draft EIS. There was not a significant impact that would require mitigation such as that described by the commenter.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
33.002	Ms.	Annie	Walker		5/6/2014	I vote in the Navajo tribal election, and I feel that I don't care where the power plants are, whether they're NGS or Four Corners Power Plant. I feel I want an input because by trade -- well, I used to be a teacher and I'm very concerned about, you know, kids. So we have kids all over the Navajo Nation, not just here in this particular area. But I think to say that you don't live here so you can't say anything, I think that's discrimination, you know. To me, that is -- so I don't like that.	Thank you for your comment. The Navajo Nation is a cooperating agency for this project and is working closely with OSMRE and the other cooperating agencies to evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed project and alternatives.
34.001	Mr.	Lorenzo	Benally		5/6/2014	The mine is -- it will really help out the economy here in San Juan County, jobs for all the people up here. The mine has about 400 employees out there, plus I think there's another like 400 out at the power plant. So if the mine doesn't go through, then the power plant will probably have no coal, so it might go down, I guess, as a pair. And I guess it's just important for all the families here.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
34.002	Mr.	Lorenzo	Benally		5/6/2014	And then trying to put that in, that would be good, add some more jobs here in the county for more people.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
35.001	Mr.	Jimmie	Walter		5/6/2014	mostly I'm worried about the socioeconomic. The way I look at it, I know we need good quality air but there is a lot of socioeconomics that is going to affect a lot of people.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
36.001	Mr.	Kennedy	Phillips		5/6/2014	And part of it, they could also -- with the loss of three units, it's really going to impact our economy too. Where are we going to get another job, you know, to be feeding our family, you know, children. Because with the plant keep going, you know, it's going to really help the ones that are running the power plant. And with the new emission put in there, you know, reduce all the pollutants, that will help keep people have their jobs, you know, behind the plant.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
37.001	Mr.	Scott	Brady		5/7/2014	We provide upwards of a third of the total tribal budget from the mine and power plant, the leases. And this doesn't even include the employment of, say, somebody like myself who is a Navajo, tribal Navajo employee, because I don't depend on the government, the Navajo Nation, but I help to bring monies in so they can use that money to fund whatever we want to do on the reservation.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
37.002	Mr.	Scott	Brady		5/7/2014	We should continue to see some kind of transformation from coal. But I don't think that is here yet. Maybe another 40 to 50 years until they develop something that would take its place. Some people have suggested nuclear but I don't think that is the way to go. We won't even dig the uranium out of our country.	Thank you for your comment. Extension of utility systems within the Navajo Nation is the purview of the Navajo Nation government and outside the scope of this EIS. An evaluation of potential impacts with regard to Environmental Justice is included in Section 4.11 of the Draft EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
37.003	Mr.	Scott	Brady		5/7/2014	I think it's still a gross negligence on our tribal government and even our citizens out here that we have people without electricity and running water. I know these power lines, grew up to learn about them, the Moenkopi line and Cholla I and II lines that go directly across the reservation, and that is a lot of energy passing people that don't even have electricity. I don't think most of them have solar power either.	Thank you for your comment. Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives.
38.001	Mr.	Johnson	Stevenson		5/7/2014	took this job as a permanent job, help my family, raise my family, kids, all that, and raised kids and helped the family, stuff like that. It was good, I liked it, I learned a lot there.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
39.001	Mr.	John	Murphy		5/7/2014	I was just going to say that I'm for this and that I think it would be good for the economy, especially with Farmington declining.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
40.001	Ms.	Debra	Murphy		5/7/2014	Basically just I think it would really hurt the economy and the livelihood of this area.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
41.001	Ms.	Jeannie	Benally		5/7/2014	And the main reason why he did that, made that decision with the people here, was because of jobs, we needed jobs, so our Navajo people, our young men and women, can have jobs and work here.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
41.002	Ms.	Jeannie	Benally		5/7/2014	I was asking questions on what would happen to the mine after it's reclaimed, then who gets it back, you know. And so I guess that's up to the tribe and the BIA, I was told. But anyway, we used to herd sheep out there, me and her, we had sheep, Area III, way out there, and so we would like to have it back because the Navajo Nation had already agreed that that land is only good for grazing and wildlife and that's what we used to do was use it for grazing.	As discussed on page 3-13 of the Draft EIS, the reclaimed areas are revegetated to ensure that the land is capable of supporting the post-mining land use, which is designated as livestock grazing and wildlife habitat. A discussion of the potential impacts to agriculture, including grazing, is included in Section 4.9, Land Use and Transportation, of the Draft EIS.
41.003	Ms.	Jeannie	Benally		5/7/2014	And then our community here has received scholarships from the mine.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
42.001	Ms.	Janet	Stevenson		5/7/2014	Although maybe like all the hazardous waste and the smoke stacks emission probably was not good for our health and the environment, but I think it did provide jobs and it provided resources for us that we probably would never be able to get ourselves, you know.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10. Pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarizes the results of the Human Health Risk Assessment performed for the Project. In addition, a discussion of the results of human health risk assessment evaluating potential impacts of the emissions from the Navajo Mine is located on pages 4.17-19 through 4.17-22 of the Draft EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
43.001	Mr.	Norman	Bryant		5/7/2014	My comments would be the power plant, the life of the power plant and the life of the coal mine will need to be extended, not only for the benefit of the local economy, but the Navajo Nation depends on the resources provided by the power plant and the Navajo mine or the coal mine for the schools and all of the programs that are -- not all the programs but some of the programs that are provided by the Navajo Nation to the elderly, to the -- in the form of utility and monetary aid. And the power plant provides monetary aid to the local schools, I think. And I know that -- I know the -- if the power plant went away and the coal mine went away, that the local economy would be devastated. I don't know if it would be beyond recovery, but it would be devastated significantly. I myself would have to hit the road, go on the road again to find work, which I don't want to do right now.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
44.001	Ms.	Lynn	Harris		5/7/2014	But it is something I am in support for because if they do shut the plant down, it would really devastate the economy in Farmington and all the surrounding areas.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
44.002	Ms.	Lynn	Harris		5/7/2014	But it's just the pollution problem, I wish they could get that part under control, which I guess they are going to be doing or in that process.	Thank you for your comment. The Draft EIS contains an evaluation of potential environmental impacts of the proposed action and alternatives for numerous resource areas, including air quality, climate change, water resources, public health, hazardous materials, noise, visual resources.
45.001		Milford			5/7/2014	Anyway, I feel like if we were to lose these industries, the Navajo Nation was to lose these industries, what other industries are there, you know. Zero on the Navajo Nation itself. They can't -- the economic impact it would cause to the Navajo Nation, not only through -- to local here but the tribe itself because of the taxes and royalties that the Navajo Nation receives from our companies, you know, it would cause a massive layoff probably at the Navajo Nation level with the tribal employees.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
46.001	Mr.	Stanley	Simms		5/7/2014	(THROUGH THE INTERPRETER) He's stated to me that he is concerned about some archeological ruins that are on top of a mesa. He didn't identify the mesa. It's on top of the mesa and it's a rock structure that he thinks is not protected. So he's wanting to know if that specific place has been identified. He noticed that when the blasting is going on at the mine, it causes the structure to crumble or move in some fashion, and he had that question and he wanted to state that concern. He identified a location called Table Mesa to the northwest of the mine, and there's a road that goes from Table Mesa through and around the mine and it passes over a railroad track. And here's the wash right here between the Table Mesa and the railroad track, and the mesa is right here within the mine area. He said the ruin is right on top of this mesa. And this is the road coming from Table Mesa to their home, which is outside the boundary of the mine.	Section 4.4, Cultural Resources of the Draft EIS discusses historical resources, archaeological resources, and traditional cultural properties that could be affected by the project. The analysis was based on extensive archaeological surveys conducted in conjunction with the Navajo Nation Tribal Preservation Office. Two programmatic agreements have been developed for the project to address the protection of cultural resources and artifacts. A discussion of the tribal and Section 106 consultation processes through which these programmatic agreements were developed is provided in Section 4.4, Cultural Resources.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
47.001	Ms.	Ena	Eltsoisie		5/7/2014	I'm concerned about our land, our grazing land area which was passed on to us by my father who has now passed on. It is north of Morgan Lake. That is where our grazing area is located. My concern is that the N36 highway has divided our grazing area. And we have people who work at the Navajo Mine and APS from the west, south, southwest and northwest. The workers come from west, south, southwest and northwest working at the Navajo Mine, and APS continuously drives through this area, our grazing area land. And when they drive through there, they made it into a very wide dirt road. Now there's no vegetation. We had sheep. We had a herd of sheep which we don't have anymore. We used to have cattle. They would drive and hit the animals, the livestock or they rustled the livestock while they're out there. It makes it very hard on us.	As discussed on page 3-13 of the Draft EIS, the reclaimed areas are revegetated to ensure that the land is capable of supporting the post-mining land use, which is designated as livestock grazing and wildlife habitat. A discussion of the potential impacts to agriculture, including grazing, is included in Section 4.9, Land Use and Transportation, of the Draft EIS.
47.002	Ms.	Ena	Eltsoisie		5/7/2014	What I would like to suggest and recommend strongly is that the company build a different road that would connect from N36 to APS road. Our grazing area has been severely damaged at this point.	The lease from the Navajo allow the use of the land for this purpose, and the SMCRA permit would require reclamation after the cessation of mining that would restore the condition of the land to support livestock grazing.
48.001	Mr.	Charles	Yazzie		5/7/2014	Because I work at the mine and the mine has provided for myself and my family.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
49.001	Mr.	Jatee	Thomas		5/7/2014	I'm pretty sure people see smog every day and say when is that going to go away or maybe just questions like that.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Air Quality is provided in Section 4.1 of the Draft EIS.
49.002	Mr.	Jatee	Thomas		5/7/2014	One thing that I didn't really get my answers fully answered on were the socioeconomics effect. I didn't really get a good answer of how many jobs are going to be created from here on out or how is it going to -- if it's even going to benefit like, as they say, revenue-wise or anything like that. That's the only thing that I didn't get answers or if I asked my questions in a correct way.	A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS. As described on page 4.10-28, no expected changes would occur to the baseline economic conditions (including total employment, industry size, labor force, and unemployment rate) within the region of influence. Under existing conditions, the Navajo Mine employs 397 people and the FCPP employs 360 people (see Section 4.10.3). The baseline condition includes the shutdown of FCPP Units 1-3 and associated lower rates of coal mining. The change from employment between 2013 to 2018 is addressed in 4.10.
50.001	Mr.	Daniel	Yazzie		5/7/2014	But, you know, just knowing that Arizona Public Service power plant gave me the opportunity to do these things. And with that, I know that, you know, there's a lot of children that are benefiting from this.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
51.001	Mr.	Stanley	Simms		5/8/2014	And one time there was a lot of -- it seems like there was a lot of dust coming from the mine, the Navajo Mine, and it was just black. Maybe some of it was coal fines, I don't know. That could be kind of a concern. If they could somehow -- I'm sure they have measures in place where they can control the dust, but that's my only concern, I guess.	A list of dust control practices at the Navajo Mine is provided in Section 3.2.6.1 of the Draft EIS, on page 3-34. The evaluation of air quality impacts associated with operation of the Navajo Mine is included in Section 4.1, Air Quality of the Draft EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
51.002	Mr.	Stanley	Simms		5/8/2014	And also I've been near the power plant itself one time, and when you're near it on certain days when it's not windy, there's just a lot of smoke. I can really smell it. And it's just like it would be a concern with the air quality. It's affecting the air quality. ...So that's my comment. The coal mine and the power plant, whatever revenue, royalties, which is good for the Navajo Nation, and it keeps the Navajo Nation running and provides revenue for them, which is a great plus.	Section 4.1, Air Quality of the Draft EIS includes an evaluation of the potential air quality impacts related to operation of the Navajo Mine and FCPP. Section 4.10, Socioeconomics, includes a discussion of the revenue received by the Navajo Nation, associated with operation of the subject facilities.
52.001	Ms.	Adella	Begay		5/8/2014	I think five were with the Navajo people and a lot of them are not here due to the draft EIS is written very technical. It's over 500 pages and it's hard for any -- even it's hard to understand that.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period and Master Response #10, Translation of the EIS.
52.002	Ms.	Adella	Begay		5/8/2014	But it states in there it's minimal. I want to see what your analysis document of why that conclusion was made. For example, I am a healthcare worker. I'm an RN, and I know there has never been a health impact study done. And it says minimal impact, but knowing -- being in the health industry and also doing some research, you know, for the different chronic diseases that I work with, 40, 50 years ago you didn't see asthma in kids. Nowadays it's pretty prevalent, and the mining company says it's because people use wood stoves. Wood stoves, yes, they do, but the heat, the temperature is not as high as these power plants. And a lot of it, I think, is due to the power plant, the pollutants. The Navajo Nation is surrounded by seven power plants, and the cost of healthcare far outstrips what these mines bring to the Navajo Nation in revenues. But the people's health, they don't really see because they refuse to see it. So to say that minimal impact on health should go ahead for another 25 years of coal mining and the power plant is really -- the draft EIS is really inadequate	The Human Health Risk Assessment conducted for the proposed project is part of the Administrative Record and is available to the public upon request. Pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarizes the results of the Human Health Risk Assessment performed for the Project. This section also summarizes the results of the fugitive dust model and the diesel particulate model, both human health studies. Section 4.1, Air Quality, also addresses human health in the context of air emissions from the FCPP and Navajo Mine. In addition, a discussion of the results of human health risk assessment evaluating potential impacts of the emissions from the Navajo Mine is located on pages 4.17-19 through 4.17-22 of the Draft EIS. Section 4.17 also summarizes the results of public health studies conducted by New Mexico Department of Health, and related studies.
52.003	Ms.	Adella	Begay		5/8/2014	And the other part is the coal ash, almost close to 50 years of coal ash that has accumulated. And I understand the coal ash -- there is no lining to keep it from seeping, but eventually even if it was lined it would seep just because of the wear and tear. And the coal ash sits there. And just recently in the news, the Duke Coal Company, they had a spill. It cost them \$10 billion to clean up 100 million tons of coal ash, and that's what the Four Corners is sitting on, 140,000,000 tons of coal ash. This needs to be -- how can they Now, climate change, it's happening. We see it in the news. It's been happening here because a lot of our ponds are drying up in the mountains, so we know it's here. So it's a real concern to have another 25 years. And for these companies to say minimal impact, that's totally, totally absurd and wrong. Where's the moral of the story here? So that's my comment.	An evaluation of the potential impacts to groundwater beneath the ash disposal areas is provided in Section 4.5, on page 4.5-57. A discussion of potential impacts associated with failure of the ash impoundments is included in Section 4.15, Hazardous Materials and Wastes. Impacts to climate changes are addressed in Section 4.2, Climate Change.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
53.001	Ms.	Robyn	Jackson	Dine CARE	5/8/2014	Fourth, an Environmental Impact Statement of the Four Corners Power Plant and the Navajo Mine is still in progress. This EIS is essential because the Department of Interior, whether BIA or the Office of Surface Mining, has never before completed a comprehensive environmental review of the Navajo Mine's impacts in the context of the Four Corners Power Plant. We are very concerned that these connected and cumulative mine-power plant impacts, such as coal ash contamination, and toxic air emissions, have caused great suffering to the Dine people, as well as to other peoples downwind of the complex. Therefore, this EIS is essential to ensure that the Dine people have a full and true understanding of the mine and power plant impacts to determine whether long-term operations of the mine-power plant are in the best interests of the Dine people.	Thank you for your comment. The EIS was prepared in accordance with CEQ NEPA regulations and the OSMRE NEPA handbook. The EIS includes an evaluation of cumulative impacts in Section 4.18, Cumulative Impacts. The potential effects of coal ash placement is also addressed in Section 4.5, Water Resources. Toxic air emissions are addressed in Section 4.1, Air Quality. The approach to environmental analysis is described in Section 4.1, and describes that the EIS addresses both the Proposed Action and alternatives, and the consequences of continued operations.
54.001	Ms.	Adella	Begay		5/8/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
55.001	Ms.	Eddie	Becenti		5/8/2014	They keep pointing to the BART determination, closing the three smaller units at the Four Corners Power Plant as the driving regulatory decision that now gives the impetus to allow the power plant to run 75 percent more of historic capacity. 75 percent equals like 1500 megawatts. The contractors claim that they have been constrained by the idea that the greenhouse gasses are not currently regulated, and as writers of the draft EIS to be adopted by Office of Surface Mining or management and the cooperating agencies, they can't assert regulatory authority because they're saying the greenhouse gasses are not currently regulated.	Future operations would be at historic operating capacity factor of Units 4 and 5.  In regards to greenhouse gases, CEQ provides draft guidance in assessing potential impacts which is followed in the Draft EIS analysis (page 4.2-16).
55.002	Ms.	Eddie	Becenti		5/8/2014	The proposed action, including the continuing operations of Navajo Mine, Four Corners Power Plant, and the transmission lines by itself would not result in a major contribution to adverse effects associated with climate change, therefore, no mitigation is required. This is what they're saying, which is not true, no mitigation is required. It's just -- it's like there is a contradiction. And why have an EIS study if they already stating that no mitigation is required. If they would show us some statements or some documentation or some studies that adhere to that statement, then it's a little different. So the draft EIS completely denies climate change impacts and discards mitigation. Now, how does this compare with what the federal government is saying on the threat of continued inaction on climate change?	The Draft EIS takes a hard look at climate change and provides a robust discussion of potential impacts of climate change (see page 4.2-1). The impacts analysis quantifies the CO <sub>2e</sub> emissions of the FCPP and mobile source emissions in the context of regional, national, and global emissions. With regards to societal costs of climate change, as stated on page 4.2-23, "while the Proposed action would contribute to the effects of climate change, its contribution relative to other sources would be minor in the short- and long-term." Implementation of the FIP for BART had the additional effect of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 26% (incorporated as part of the baseline). When compared to other sources of GHG in the region, the reduced contribution from FCPP is considered minor. As such, no additional mitigation measures are recommended.
55.003	Ms.	Eddie	Becenti		5/8/2014	I have four potential outcome scenarios as to why the draft EIS is so important. One, the future of FCPP hinges on Arizona Public Service, APS, investing the selective catalytic reduction in Units 4 and 5, with the plan to keep the coal plant running for 25 more years at approximately 75 percent, 1500 megawatts, of historic operations. In the EIS process, we will focus on the continued CO <sub>2</sub> emissions, at a time when carbon regulation is forthcoming, generation coal combustion waste and other issues that will raise costs, liabilities and make coal less favorable for APS.	Please see Master Response #13, Cost of Electricity.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
55.004	Ms.	Eddie	Becenti		5/8/2014	Two, we could advocate for an alternative in the EIS for a shorter time frame, ten years, to transition from Four Corners' area reliance on coal to renewables, taking advantage of existing transmission, mine reclamation areas for solar, and great conditions for solar. The draft EIS quickly discounts renewables and attempts to portray that coal is our only choice.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives.
55.005	Ms.	Eddie	Becenti		5/8/2014	Three, due to the federal trust role at the FCPP/Navajo Mine complex, we are seeking Department of the Interior engagement -- they prepared the EIS -- to evaluate economic opportunities for the region to transition from historic reliance on coal and coal energy export. Also our region needs to seek expertise and funding to develop an alternative energy vision.	The project purpose and need focuses on this project, and alternatives related to alternative energy to coal were evaluated in the Alternatives section. It is the stated intent of NTEC to evaluate alternative energy-generating technologies.
55.006	Ms.	Eddie	Becenti		5/8/2014	Four, we seek full accounting of liabilities, costs, bonds associated with historic and future operations of FCPP and Navajo Mine. Although it is being portrayed that the economics of continued operations at FCPP and Navajo Mine will be profitable, coal is in decline naturally, and full investment in aged coal facilities could deter the region from moving ahead economically. The complex should be cleaned up before it is allowed to operate in the future.	As the trustee, the Secretary of the Interior has a responsibility that federally sponsored or permitted projects do not create a liability that the US Federal Government would assume. As part of the trust review process, the Secretary is yet to sign Lease Amendment #3 to authorize the renewal of the FCPP lease; therefore, issues regarding environmental liabilities from continued operations of FCPP and Navajo Mine are still being considered via the NEPA process.  In regards to the financial and economic nature of the overall operation, NTEC made a business decision to acquire the Navajo Mine believing that the purchase would result in additional revenues for the Navajo Nation. The majority of accounting and financial information is considered proprietary and has not been disclosed to OSMRE. However, detailed information regarding how the project effects the local, state, and tribal economies is included in Section 4.10.
55.007	Ms.	Eddie	Becenti		5/8/2014	Action items: Two, given the stark realities brought forth by the national climate assessment, it is imperative that we devise a timely strategy to engage with decision makers to portray our abject displeasure with this draft EIS that gets nowhere close to adequately analyzing climate change, and the multitude of issues plaguing FCPP and connected facilities. Department of the Interior and EPA need to be called out.	See Master Response #5, Greenhouse Gases
55.008	Ms.	Eddie	Becenti		5/8/2014	Three, renewable energy alternatives are summarily dismissed in the draft EIS, eliminated from further consideration. This is unacceptable and points to deficiencies in draft EIS consultants taking marching orders from project proponents to dismiss a reasonable range of alternatives.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
56.001	Ms.	Sarah	White		5/8/2014	<p>Number one, I'm going to talk about -- the first one that I wanted to talk about is the way this Environmental Impact Study comments is set up. That is a big concern to the Navajo people, the community people. That is why we hardly seen Navajo people here. And, actually, I think we had a better turnout here and we got a better turnout in Nenahnezad because the mine worker, they all come from there. But then again, those are the educated ones that -- you know, the ones that up in age. But those -- we had elderlies, we have handicap people that -- I feel that they are -- they got cheated out of this Environmental Impact Study comments because we have to go to their homes and they -- the Navajos live like from about three miles, five miles apart and we had to go to their homes to get them to make comments and send them in and we're short on manpower. And a lot of these elderlies or handicap can't drive because they don't have a vehicle, and the way it's set up, the community people are very upset about, they don't like it like this. They walk in and they feel uncomfortable because you have to go here and go here and to this poster and this poster and that poster and they don't feel comfortable about that. Another thing is that a lot of our community people are -- a lot of them are elders, they can't stand very long, they can't -- they have either arthritis problems or back problems, so they would rather sit down and they would like to have an open mic. That is what they would like. And that's what I think would be very more comfortable and efficient for these people and more comfortable and more -- better atmosphere because they want to see other people making comments and hear their voice and then, you know, that is how they like it. And what I think should have been done, the way should have been done is like time them, like maybe three to four minutes, you know, to make their comments. And that works. It always works because we always use them. And still have this setup for people who doesn't want to speak in public in the other corner. And still put your posters for people who would love to go around and look at it. And it should be set up with all three ways of communication to make these comments. But the way it's set up is they're very unhappy with it and they don't like it. So not only me, I feel uncomfortable with it too, I had to drag a chair around because I have a problem with my ankle so I can't stand very long. And so that is one of the biggest concern for my community people. And they told me to go ahead and make a comment on that one.</p>	Please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
56.002	Ms.	Sarah	White		5/8/2014	And then another one is the EIS book they say is 1500 pages. And we had a lot of people that are -- they can't read. And so they would like to have a Navajo video to listen to it and see what it's about before they make their comments. And also the book is very technical. Some people have limited education and they say, come, take a look. This is native, this is native people, this is not highly educated people. So we need these in our standard to instead of all this high tech, we can't understand a lot of these things. So that would really make it comfortable for us to understand what are in the EIS book and what everybody is talking about. So according to this, I feel that the people out there is very -- got cheated out of all this comment, you know, as many comment stops as these guys make, you know. It's not -- it didn't benefit everybody, so we got a problem there.	Please see Master Response #10, Translation of the EIS
57.001	Mr.	Arvin	Trujillo		5/9/2014	The other thing is given that all of that work has been done, the socioeconomic aspects also are a main concern to me. I think it's real important to have those dollars.....So I'm supporting the Alternative A aspects and look forward to seeing that operation continue into the future.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic Impacts of the project is included in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
58.000	Mr.	Eugenio	Perez		5/9/2014	My comment is overall socioeconomically, you can't shut the mine down. But I think that they should at least return Area 1 to the people and make some kind of use of that land if it's safe and usable for the people.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is included in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS, and Section 4.10.4 includes analysis of likely results if the Navajo Mine SMCRA permit was not renewed. Please also see Section 3.2.1.1 ("Reclamation" subheading) for additional information on the bond release process when reclamation standards are met.
59.001	Mr.	Randy	Rogers	Farmington Fire Equipment and Safety	4/29/2014	If you consider the hundreds that are employed by the mines and power plants and extend it out to the family members who are supported by those employees, it adds up to thousands who are benefited by the coal and power industries. It is the bedrock of our community. We are just one of many small businesses in the community who are the beneficiaries of the industry. It makes a difference in lifestyle for all of us who live here.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic Impacts of the project is included in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
59.002	Mr.	Randy	Rogers	Farmington Fire Equipment and Safety	4/29/2014	As the years have gone by and technology has improved updates have been made to equipment to minimize the environmental impact here. In the areas that have been mined and reclaimed you can't tell that mining ever took place. If they had a short term view they could have come in and cared only about making money at the expense of the environment. They have not done that. They have a long term outlook and care about leaving the land the same or better than it was when they started. Many upgrades have been made over the years.	Thank you for your comment. A discussion of Reclamation practices at the Navajo Mine is included in Section 2.1.6 of the Draft EIS.
59.003	Mr.	Randy	Rogers	Farmington Fire Equipment and Safety	4/29/2014	One of the things I appreciate about working with BHP, PNM, and APS is their strong emphasis on Safety. They care about their employees and contractors. They want everyone to go home to their families safely each night. They insist that care be taken on each job to make sure accidents are kept to a minimum. They do not tolerate unsafe practices.	Thank you for your comment. A discussion of worker safety is included in Section 4.17, Health and Safety.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
59.004	Mr.	Randy	Rogers	Farmington Fire Equipment and Safety	4/29/2014	Losing the Mine and Power plant capacity in our area would be devastating for all the communities in this area.	Thank you for your comment. A discussion of the Socioeconomic impacts of the project is included in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
60.001	Mr.	George	Madrid	GEOMAT Inc.	4/30/2014	Their continuing business is important to our continuing success. I know of many other businesses in our community that rely on doing business with BHPB. Without BHPB, our community would suffer the loss of many good paying jobs and the economic impact would be devastating.	Thank you for your comment. A discussion of the Socioeconomic impacts of the project is included in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
61.001	Ms.	Anne	Perkins-Parrot		5/5/2014	As the coal powered plant s have been allowed to pollute and store coal ash using less than best practices, all the people have suffered from additional asthma, lung diseases, cancers and the poverty remains, while the vast resources of the impoverished have by and large gone into the pockets of the ever increasingly wealthy corporations, CEO's and stockholders who have never seen the smoke-belching stacks and the brown haze or been told not to eat fish that they have caught to eat because of mercury contamination.	Thank you for your comment. The Human Health Risk Assessment conducted for the proposed project is part of the Administrative Record and is available to the public upon request.Pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarizes the results of the Human Health Risk Assessment performed for the Project. In addition, a discussion of the results of human health risk assessment evaluating potential impacts of the emissions from the Navajo Mine is located on pages 4.17-19 through 4.17-22 of the Draft EIS. An evaluation of potential impacts with regard to environmental justice is included in Section 4.11 of the Draft EIS.
62.001	Ms.	Marilyn	McCord		5/6/2014	Over my 25 years here (full time) I have seen the increase in air pollution in the Four Corners, experienced the worsening of my allergies, and despaired at the posting of Vallecito Reservoir for mercury content.	Thank you for your comment. An evaluation of the potential air quality impacts of the proposed action and alternatives is included in Section 4.1, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS. Health and Safety is addressed in Section 4.17. The Human Health Risk Assessment conducted for the proposed project is part of the Administrative Record and is available to the public upon request.Pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarizes the results of the Human Health Risk Assessment performed for the Project. In addition, a discussion of the results of human health risk assessment evaluating potential impacts of the emissions from the Navajo Mine is located on pages 4.17-19 through 4.17-22 of the Draft EIS
62.002	Ms.	Marilyn	McCord		5/6/2014	If the phase-out of the plant needs to be more gradual, please consider the most restrictive (yet realistic) options possible.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives.
63.001	Ms.	Marshall	Porter-Norton		5/6/2014	I am for the "No Action" alternative with the caveat that I would like to see federal funds put to better use creating jobs in the solar and renewable energy industries creating new, replacement jobs specifically targeted to area Navajo Tribe Members. If the power plant is to continue, I am NOT in favor of developing a new coal mining area. Our area depends on tourism. Our mountains and fish in our lakes are polluted with mercury from the power plant. Entire views capes are affected. This is entirely unacceptable. This plant should be retired and we should put in place energy industries in the Four Corners that more closely match the values of the residents; the needs and health of the people; and the desired longevity of our pristine landscapes.	Thank you for your comment. The project is entirely funded by the owners of the Navajo Mine, FCPP, and PNM, not the federal government. Therefore, allocation of federal funds for the creation of jobs in the renewable energy industry is outside the scope of this NEPA process.  With regard to tourism and other socioeconomic impacts, these are addressed in Sections 4.10, Socioeconomics, and 4.16, Recreation, of the EIS. The potential impacts of mercury deposition are addressed in Sections 4.1, Air Quality, 4.5, Water Resources, and 4.8, Threatened and Endangered Species. Visibility and visual resources are addressed in Section 4.1, Air Quality and Section 4.13, Visual Resources, of the Draft EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
63.002	Ms.	Marshall	Porter-Norton		5/6/2014	Further, a revised EIS should be issued that better considers: The impacts on global climate change; Cumulative impacts; Drought conditions and water resources; The impacts of the plant on local health issues; Toxic waste data including storage, removal and remediation and the impacts on the local people and land; Air and water quality impacts including to surrounding areas in Colorado; Impacts of and amounts of mercury and selenium levels.	<p>Please see Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS. Impacts of global climate changes are addressed in Section 4.2, Climate Change and Section 4.18.2.2 of the Draft EIS. Cumulative impacts are addressed in Section 4.18. Water resources are addressed in Section 4.5. Local health issues are addressed in Section 4.17, Health and Safety. Toxic waste data, including storage, removal, and remediation is addressed in Section 4.15, Hazardous materials and wastes. Air quality is addressed in Section 4.1. The region of influence for both air quality and water resources extends into portions of Colorado. Impacts of and amounts of mercury and selenium levels are addressed in Section 4.1, Air Quality, 4.5, Water Resources, and 4.8, Threatened and Endangered Species.</p> <p>With regard to drought conditions, the following has been added to Section 4.5.2.2: Recent drought conditions in the Southwest have further decreased flow rates in the San Juan River.</p>
64.001	Mr.	Peter	Schmidt		5/6/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
65.001	Mr.	Bertram	Benally		5/7/2014	In today's economy every little bit helps even the furthest chapter has benefited from the continuous operation of both company's.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is included in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
66.001	Ms.	Cyndi	Ortman		5/8/2014	The DEIS is deficient in its analysis of the full economic environmental, and human health costs.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis.
67.001	Ms.	Roxanne	Rogers		5/8/2014	I think the EIS should include the effects on human health throughout the Four Corners area, the effect on climate change which is an urgent issue which must be addressed immediately, "green" alternatives for the Four Corners Power.	Pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarizes the results of the Human Health Risk Assessment performed for the Project. In addition, a discussion of the results of human health risk assessment evaluating potential impacts of the emissions from the Navajo Mine is located on pages 4.17-19 through 4.17-22 of the Draft EIS. Potential effects with regard to climate change are addressed in Section 4.2, Climate Change and Section 4.18, Cumulative Impacts. With regard to "green" alternatives, please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives.
67.002	Ms.	Roxanne	Rogers		5/8/2014	Because of coal- fired power plants, the air around the area, including Shiprock and Cortez, Mesa Verde National Park, the Navajo Nation, is far for clear with distant views shrouded in smog-like particulates.	Thank you for your comment. Potential impacts with regard to visibility are addressed in Section 4.1, Air Quality.
68.001	Mr.	Vincent	Yazzie		5/8/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
69.001	Mr.	Vincent	Yazzie		5/8/2014	Attached are NOx levels as measured by GOME on May 5, 2014. Zooming into Four Corners Power Plant and San Juan Generating Station reveals NOx that still creates visibility problems at Mesa Verde National Park. Also attached is a report where BHP misapplied a percentage to low ball the coal rank of the coal. EPA models were based upon low balled coal rank values. EPA refused to readjust there models to correct for the proper and higher coal rank values. Leaves open questions of what is the correct power plant rating of Four Corners Power Plant?	The EIS air quality analysis was developed in early 2013; therefore, the NOx data from 2014 are not included. Because the EIS analysis was based on 12 years of historic air emissions data and because the impact analyses were based on the peak-year emissions rather than the 12-year average, the NOx analysis is a reasonable estimation of future operations. Future emissions estimates are based on the historic worst-year emissions data, not on EPA coal type (e.g., sub-bituminous, bituminous) estimates; therefore, the power plant rating is essentially a measurement, not a power plant rating based on EPA coal type estimates.
69.002	Mr.	Vincent	Yazzie		5/8/2014	Here is the EPA scientific integrity policy. <a href="http://www.epa.gov/osa/pdfs/epa_scientific_integrity_policy_20120115.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/osa/pdfs/epa_scientific_integrity_policy_20120115.pdf</a>	Thank you for your comment. The Draft EIS was prepared in accordance with CEQ NEPA regulations and the OSMRE NEPA Handbook. Technical analyses and supplemental studies conducted in order to evaluate impacts in the Draft EIS follow methods considered acceptable by the scientific community and were prepared in close coordination with the Cooperating Agencies, including EPA.
70.001	Mr.	Jason	Meininger		5/9/2014	Please stop allowing coal fired power plants to pollute the air and water of the 4 corners. The continued burning of coal is a detriment to the quality of lives of almost every resident and visitor to our beautiful region.	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS and will notify the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in spring 2015.
71.001	Mr.	Dave	Rich		5/9/2014	Given the problems of global warming and air pollution, I favor closing both the Navajo Coal Mine and the Four Corners Power Plant.	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS and will notify the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in spring 2015.
72.001	Ms.	Louise	Teal		5/9/2014	As our nation reduces it's coal power generation and begins to shift to cleaner options - it makes no sense to commit more money to the Four Corners complex, nor endure more environmental destruction in the SW. At best, shut this plant down.	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS and will notify the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in spring 2015.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
72.002	Ms.	Louise	Teal		5/9/2014	the Dept. of the Interior should do a sound and complete assessment of the accurate and total cost financially of continuing the Plant and Mine. This cost should include damage to the environment and our health; including calculating the true cost of 258 metric tons of carbon added to our atmosphere or the effects of mercury in our waters.	The socioeconomic effects of continuing operations at the FCPP and Navajo Mine are discussed in Section 4.10 of the EIS and effects to human health, including mercury emissions and deposition, are founded on the findings of Section 4.1 (Air Quality), Section 4.17 (Health and Safety), and references cited therein.  A quantitative analysis of the social cost of carbon (SCC) has been added to the Final EIS in Section 4.2. The Draft EIS considered the SCC in a qualitative manner, but did not quantify the effects. Subsequent to issuance of the Draft EIS, CEQ published Draft Guidance on climate change analysis (CEQ 2014), in which CEQ indicates that emissions monetization is not required in every project-level NEPA analysis. Nonetheless, OSMRE determined that a quantitative analysis would be included in the Final EIS, following the Interagency Working Group Methods. The results of the SCC analysis do not change the conclusions or the findings of level of significance for the Climate Change issue; however, the analysis has been added to provide additional context to OSMRE's decision.
73.001	Ms.	Lisa	Allee		5/10/2014	I live above Cortez, Colorado with a beautiful view of the Ute Mountain, Mesa Verde and in the distance the Chuska Mountains. But many days there is a steady creep of smog obscuring the view--smog created by the filthy, very old coal-fired power plants and the incredible dust cloud created by the mining operations. It is time for the air quality in the Four Corners area to improve!!	Thank you for your comment. The potential impacts to air quality and visibility is addressed in Section 4.1, Air Quality of the Draft EIS.
73.002	Ms.	Lisa	Allee		5/10/2014	The era of coal needs to end and instead we need to use the abundant solar and wind energy available!! Please consider the following:  • The Four Corners does not want to prolong for 25 years the operations of a dirty, antiquated coal plant that will add 258 million metric tons of carbon pollution to our atmosphere (the equivalent of 54 MILLION cars).	Thank you for your comment. With regard to renewable energy, please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives. OSMRE is considering all alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS and will notify the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in spring 2015.
73.003	Ms.	Lisa	Allee		5/10/2014	• The DEIS is deficient in its analysis of the full economic, environmental, and human health costs of this project.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
73.004	Ms.	Lisa	Allee		5/10/2014	Asthma rates in the Four Corners are ridiculously high and the mercury levels in the fish make it unwise to eat more than one a year--all this from the dirty coal plants--the smokestacks and the ash piles. Then there is the concern of uranium in the smoke and ash also....	Pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarizes the results of the Human Health Risk Assessment performed for the Project. In addition, a discussion of the results of human health risk assessment evaluating potential impacts of the emissions from the Navajo Mine is located on pages 4.17-19 through 4.17-22 of the Draft EIS. With regard to mercury, this is addressed in the Human Health Risk Assessment, and the Ecological Risk Assessment. Please see Master Response #4, Mercury Level in Fish in Nearby Lakes.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
73.005	Ms.	Lisa	Allee		5/10/2014	Please help end the tragedy the Four Corners area has lived with for so long--let's move out of the dirty coal era and into a clean renewable energy era!!	Thank you for your comment. With regard to renewable energy, please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives. OSMRE is considering all alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS and will notify the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated spring 2015.
74.001	Mr.	Stephen P.	Krest		5/10/2014	Looking at the future I believe this EIS needs to address clean energy alternatives to the status quo coal energy production. The federal government once played a huge role in building the coal infrastructure on the Navajo Reservation. Now it is time for our government to do the same for alternative clean energy sources.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives.
74.002	Mr.	Stephen P.	Krest		5/10/2014	The EIS needs to consider all of the environmental impacts of a prolonged coal plant operations: mercury and selenium levels in our lakes and rivers, climate change and drought, ozone, and the public health. There is solid science quantifying these issues and these should be cited in your report. The costs of another 25 years of carbon pollution should not be glossed over.	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015. With regard to consideration of environmental impacts, please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis and Master Response #4, Mercury Deposition and Fish in Nearby Lakes. The societal cost is addressed in Chapter 4.2, Climate Change.
74.003	Mr.	Stephen P.	Krest		5/10/2014	The coal fired power plants and their related coal mines, it's true, are the source of many jobs. However the plants are also the source of our air pollution; spewing tons of elements into the air we breathe. (Think asthma) I applaud recent EPA rulings to reduce these pollutants.	Thank you for your comment. Discussion of socioeconomic impacts of the project is included in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS. Air quality and public health are addressed in Section 4.1 and 4.17, respectively.
75.001	Mr.	Ken	Levine		5/10/2014	There are better alternatives out there to produce electricity. If they cost slightly more it is worth it in the long run and any cost differences are getting less. Let's do the right thing environmentally and go more towards natural sustainable technologies such as solar, wind, geothermal, and hydro. Prolonging the coal age is just going to cost the planet dearly in the future and a big mistake. New environmental facilities make sense for our and the planet's future.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives.
75.002	Mr.	Ken	Levine		5/10/2014	There are 2 alternatives in the works here that could soon take some of the burden off that plant. A biomass and a geothermal power plants are trying to be built but in the red tape planning stages at this point. They could be online within a couple years and be much better alternatives.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives.
76.001	Ms.	Beatrice	Sims		5/10/2014	I support the approval of the Pinabete Permit area. It would be very exciting to be able to have employment for another 25 years past 2016.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is included in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
76.002	Ms.	Beatrice	Sims		5/10/2014	Another reason I would like to see Navajo Mine continue for the next 25 years is because of the Navajo Nation economy. Coal royalties support 33% or 50% of the Navajo Nation economy. If this mine shuts down, Navajo people will have to move away from the reservation or their homeland to find jobs. The royalties received from coal mines is infused into the Navajo Nation economy through payroll, welfare, outreach programs, or through chapters.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is included in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
77.001	Mr.	Gary	Skiba		5/10/2014	I am requesting that OSMRE revise its analysis in the FCPP and Navajo Mine project to fully disclose the impacts and consider viable alternatives to the project.	Thank you for your comment. The Draft EIS was prepared in accordance with CEQ NEPA regulations and the OSMRE NEPA Handbook. With regard to alternatives, please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives.
77.002	Mr.	Gary	Skiba		5/10/2014	Our dependence on coal for power production is appropriately declining. The authorization of continued coal based power production flies in the face of our need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, especially when alternatives exist. Citizens of the four corners have suffered from the impacts of continued coal production, including increased respiratory illness, view robbing haze, and fish consumption advisories due to mercury contamination.	Thank you for your comment. Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives. Greenhouse gases are discussed in Section 4.2, Climate Change, of the Draft EIS. Public health is evaluated in Section 4.17, Health and Safety. Visibility is addressed in Section 4.1, Air Quality.
77.003	Mr.	Gary	Skiba		5/10/2014	Approval of the Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plan project envisioned will continue these impacts for two to three decades. Rather than continuing those impacts, we should move to cleaner power production at every opportunity. The analysis of impacts on human health, environmental costs, and economics needs to be revised and improved.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
78.001	Mr.	Mark	Walker		5/10/2014	1. Analysis of health impacts and the true cost of coal operation in the EIS is too rushed	Pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarize the results of the Human Health Risk Assessment performed for the Project. In addition, a discussion of the results of human health risk assessment evaluating potential impacts of the emissions from the Navajo Mine is located on pages 4.17-19 through 4.17-22 of the Draft EIS.  A quantitative analysis of the social cost of carbon (SCC) has been added to the Final EIS in Section 4.2. The Draft EIS considered the SCC in a qualitative manner, but did not quantify the effects. Subsequent to issuance of the Draft EIS, CEQ published Draft Guidance on climate change analysis (CEQ 2014), in which CEQ indicates that emissions monetization is not required in every project-level NEPA analysis. Nonetheless, OSMRE determined that a quantitative analysis would be included in the Final EIS, following the Interagency Working Group Methods. The results of the SCC analysis do not change the conclusions or the findings of level of significance for the Climate Change issue; however, the analysis has been added to provide additional context to OSMRE's decision.
78.002	Mr.	Mark	Walker		5/10/2014	We are tired of suffering the impacts of providing energy for other areas of the country. As an example of the impacts in this region, I need only look out my back door to the reservoirs where we have a fish advisory due to Mercury deposition which has been solidly linked to the burning of coal in the Four Corners Region.	Please see Master Response #4, Mercury deposition and mercury in fish in nearby lakes.
78.003	Mr.	Mark	Walker		5/10/2014	2. While complete and immediate closure of the power plant is too much to expect and would harm the local economy, an additional 25 years of operation is unbearable! There is room for compromise here... a move toward clean energy could be accomplished by requiring that a portion of	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						the profits from continued operation of the power plant go into building out a sola replacement. The infrastructure is there and the solar potential must be great. The compromise would be a gradual shutdown of the plant over a shorter time period and required upgrades to the solar farm as the industry develops.	
78.004	Mr.	Mark	Walker		5/10/2014	3. The Navajo have bought an unknown environmental liability. Reclamation of coal mines and ash disposal pits is expensive. Is the true cost for reclamation of existing conditions known? Will bonds cover the true cost of reclamation of another 25 years of operation?	NTEC made a business decision to acquire the Navajo Mine, including all the benefits and liabilities associated with its operation. Reclamation activities are planned years in advance of implementation, so the costs of these activities are accounted for in operational budgets. Furthermore, reclamation activities are planned and performed to comply with the regulatory requirements under SMCRA. The bonds mandated by SMCRA are to serve as an insurance policy in the event that initial reclamation treatments fall short of full compliance and additional work is required.
79.001	Mr.	Joe	Ward		5/10/2014	It's high time to close down those abominations and opt for clean energy in place of filthy coal.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives
80.001	Ms.	Erika	Brown		5/12/2014	I am disappointed that the draft EIS for the Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant did not adequately assess alternatives to coal nor did the analysis encompass the true cost of coal to the surrounding communities, including air and water pollution, health impacts, fisheries impacts, and wider impacts of climate change. I strongly urge you to revise this draft EIS to reflect the TRUE impacts of this project and to fully assess the alternatives to coal for many decades to come. This community should be benefitting from a cleaner energy future, not be stuck in the past due to faulty and short-sited assessments.	With regard to alternatives to coal, please see Master Response #2, Alternatives. The Draft EIS evaluates potential impacts to groundwater and surface water quality in Section 4.5, air quality in Section 4.1, human health and safety in Section 4.17, wildlife and special status species in Sections 4.7 and 4.8 respectively, and climate change in Section 4.2.  A quantitative analysis of the social cost of carbon (SCC) has been added to the Final EIS in Section 4.2. The Draft EIS considered the SCC in a qualitative manner, but did not quantify the effects. Subsequent to issuance of the Draft EIS, CEQ published Draft Guidance on climate change analysis (CEQ 2014), in which CEQ indicates that emissions monetization is not required in every project-level NEPA analysis. Nonetheless, OSMRE determined that a quantitative analysis would be included in the Final EIS, following the Interagency Working Group Methods. The results of the SCC analysis do not change the conclusions or the findings of level of significance for the Climate Change issue; however, the analysis has been added to provide additional context to OSMRE's decision.
81.001	Ms.	Amy	McClintok		5/12/2014	I am asking for the "No Action Alternative," which would require the existing permit to end in 2016. The clean up should begin immediately thereafter. The reason I support this action is because we need to change to renewable sources of energy NOW. Our air quality is poor, public health is at risk, and climate change is wreaking havoc on ecosystems, water quality and wildlife survival, not to mention our own. A switch to renewable energies must begin immediately before it's too late. The mine workers could be retrained to manufacture, install and maintain the renewable energies, so they wouldn't be out of work.	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
82.001	Mr.	Vincent	Yazzie		5/9/2014	<p>The original graph for Figure 6-3 is from the Environmental Assessment(EA) or Ch6GroundwaterHydrology.pdf</p> <p>The Picture Cliff Sandstone transmissivity is found in FCPP EIS volume 1 on page 4.5-10 or 416/960. Table 4.5-4 Groundwater Aquifer Properties in the San Juan Basin. The Picture Cliff Sandstone transmissivity is 0.12 square foot per day or 0.9 gal/day/ft. as found in the Environmental assessment. EA Figure 6-3 was then extended. Red line shows correct drawing of line, but bad selection of the coordinates. Bad coordinates were then used to calculate water transmissivity. I am afraid the aquifer properties would have to be recalculated.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and the information provided. The permit application provides a characterization of the groundwater environment, and specifically groundwater quantity at Chapter 6, Section 6.2 (now Section 18.2.5.1 in the e-permit). To characterize the transmissivity of the Picture Cliffs Sandstone, an aquifer recovery test was performed, and graphical analysis was completed using the McWhorter method (1980). Graphical analysis is at Chapter 6, Section 6.2, Figure 6-3 (now Section 18.2.5.1, Figure 18-4 in the e-permit). Application of graphical analysis requires some interpretation to identify where the slope line intercepts the x-axis. For this analysis, the x-axis intercept point could be interpreted as a value of 1.0 or 1.1. A value of 1.0 was used in the permit, resulting in a transmissivity of 0.12 square foot per day. Using a value of 1.1 would result in a transmissivity of 0.13 square foot per day. The Draft EIS at Table 4.5-4, characterizes the transmissivity to have a variable range between 0.12 to 0.79 square foot per day. Interpretation of an x-axis intercept of 1.1 would still result in a transmissivity within the range provided at Table 4.5-4, and not affect the impact analysis or the conclusion presented in the Draft EIS.</p>
82.002	Mr.	Vincent	Yazzie		5/9/2014	Add 60 more days to the comment period to look for more errors.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
83.001	Mr.	Vincent	Yazzie		5/9/2014	<p>Draft EIS volume 1, page 4.10-13 (653 of 960), Table 4.10-13 Summary of Navajo Nation Taxes and Royalties by BNCCAnnual Average of Total Navajo Nation Payments is \$40,184,255</p> <p>The number \$40,184,255 is for coal sold at sub-bituminous prices.</p> <p>The coal if sold at the correct coal revenue would bring in an average of \$120,946,527 per year. See attached Navajo_Coal_Royalty_Calculations_05102014.pdf</p> <p>Corrections to the numbers were made from the numbers were submitted as part of the appeal of the Environmental Assessment.</p> <p>NTEC is just continuing the practices of BHP by taking advantage of the Navajo people. This is robbery. If this robbery continues the Navajo people will lose \$2.3 billion in Navajo Nation Payments. BHP and APS have conspired to tell the Navajo people that Navajo Mine coal is sub-bituminous which has a lower price instead of selling the coal at bituminous prices. See EPA-R09-OAR-2010-0683-0056.pdf</p>	<p>NTEC and the FCPP co-owners entered into a Coal Supply Agreement (see Section 2.4.2.1) that stipulates that coal mined at Navajo Mine is to be used soely at FCPP. This agreement serves as a negotiated financial contract and it is not within the purview of the EIS to intervene or comment on the agreed-upon price of coal. The role of an EIS is to analyze potential effects, including socioeconomic, of a proposed action and alternatives to that action, but not to determine if the proposed action itself is a good business deal for the parties involved. Furthermore, under federal trust policy, the Secretary of the Interior and/or BIA reviews transactions that involve the sale of a tribal trust asset (i.e. coal) to ensure the appropriate management, development, and protection of that asset (see Section 4.12.1).</p>
84.001	Mr.	Vincent	Yazzie		5/10/2014	<p>A conversation with Vinny Spotleson about pink steam clouds from Four Corners Power Plant attribtuble to high nitrogen or nitrates in the exhaust. Goes back to much NOx from incorrectly measure NOx emissions as the coal rank calculations were off. Navajo Mine coal has been incorrectly classified as sub-bituminous when it should be bituminous coal. Any ammonia SCR system would be overpower with to much NOx. SCR would not be engineered to handle the extra NOx.</p>	<p>Future emissions estimates are based on the historic worst-year emissions data, not on EPA sub-bituminous or bituminous coal estimates. The selective catalytic reduction (SCR) technology will be implemented in conformance with the USEPA Final Implementation Plan and BART requirements, ensuring best available technology for NOx emissions management.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
85.001	Mr.	Vincent	Yazzie		5/9/2014	<p>Four Corners Power Plant is running out of water.</p> <p>Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine Energy Project, Draft Environmental Impact Statement Section 4.12.2.3 Water, page 4.12-2, (716 of 960), Section 4.12.4.1 Alternative A - Proposed Action, page 4.12-6 (720 of 960) assures that there is water for the Four Corners Power Plant. This came out yesterday, that there is not enough water for the Four Corners Power Plant.</p> <p>Further, assured supplies of water are important for the Company's operations and assets, including Four Corners. Four Corners is located in a region that has been experiencing drought conditions which could affect the plant's water supply. Four Corners has accordingly been involved in negotiations and proceedings with third parties relating to water supply issues. The drought conditions and related negotiations and proceedings could adversely affect the amount of power available, or the price thereof, from Four Corners.</p>	As described in Section 2.2.4, Plant Water Supply, on page 2-23 of the Draft EIS, water supply for the FCPP is pumped from the San Juan River. Water rights for the FCPP is through a water rights permit held by BHP Billiton. As discussed in Section 4.5 of the Draft EIS, review of annual reports from BNCC indicate that the full amount of consumptive water rights was not used between 2010 and 2012, in accordance with a voluntary agreement to reduce water use. However, water supply for the FCPP and Navajo Mine is permitted for the proposed duration of the Proposed Action and would not adversely affect the amount of power available, or price thereof, from FCPP.
86.001	Mr.	Andy	Willis		5/12/2014	Please do not extend the lease without major requirements to reduce the air borne pollution in the 4 corners region. The fish in the alpine lakes of the San Juan Mountains are polluted w/ high levels of mercury.	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015. With regard to including requirements to reduce air pollution in the region, please see Master Response #12, Conditions as Part of the Lease or Mine Permit. With regard to mercury levels of fish, please see Master Response 4, Mercury Levels in Fish in Nearby Lakes.
86.002	Mr.	Andy	Willis		5/12/2014	Please pursue renewable energy sources instead.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives.
87.001		Jo	Young		5/12/2014	The Four Corners does not want to prolong for 25 years the operations of a dirty, antiquated coal plant that will add 258 million metric tons of carbon pollution to our atmosphere (the equivalent of 54 MILLION cars).	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.
87.002		Jo	Young		5/12/2014	The Four Corners is tired of being a dumping ground for air, land and water pollutants associated with power that is shipped out of our region. The DEIS is deficient in its analysis of the full economic, environmental, and human health costs of this project.	Thank you for your comment. Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
88.001		Dine Care			5/13/2014	Request for 60 extension on Comment period	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
89.001	Mr.	Scott	Garlid		5/13/2014	I don't believe the environmental impact statement thoroughly explored the total impact to the environment and region nor has thoroughly explored alternatives.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis and Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives.
89.002	Mr.	Scott	Garlid		5/13/2014	If your studies tell you there is no or minimal impact, I think you're either looking at the wrong data or you've got a confirmation bias and you're only seeing what you choose to see.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
89.003	Mr.	Scott	Garlid		5/13/2014	What about wind power or solar? Both are clean; both are in abundance on Rez and we should be able to figure out a way to use the transmission infrastructure that's already there.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives
90.001	Mr.	Jerold	Morris		5/13/2014	Because , there will be no good paying jobs and the whole area will be in decline . ...The Navajo Nation gets a lot of revenue from the royalties for its operating cost, it will be devastating for the tribe if this permit fails.	Thank you for your comment. Section 4.10, Socioeconomics includes a discussion of the revenue received by the Navajo Nation, associated with operation of the subject facilities.
91.001	Mr.	Vincent	Yazzie		5/14/2014	<p>There is more historical material on Four Corners Power Plant international notorious image. This link and the link in the previous link have little write ups and testimony on Four Corners Power Plant from 1971. Many of the documents were obtained from the ASU law library online research collection June 1,2, 2013 on the Eric Swenson paper.</p> <p>The image is from Problems of Electrical Power Production in the Southwest, Hearings before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs United States Senate, 92nd Congress, First Session on Environmental Problems Associated with the Production of Electrical Power by Coal-Fired Plants in the Four Corners Region of the Southwest U.S., Albuquerque, N. Mex.-May 24, 1971, Part 1. (36 MB).</p> <p>The quoted image is by Manuel Lujan, Jr. on FCPP smoke being visible by the Mercury astronauts.  <a href="http://www.navajohopilittlecoloradoriverwatersettlement2012.info/southwest_electrical_power_problems_albq_05241971_part_1.pdf">http://www.navajohopilittlecoloradoriverwatersettlement2012.info/southwest_electrical_power_problems_albq_05241971_part_1.pdf</a></p> <p>Still many things to historically read from the June 1,2, 2013 download session.</p>	<p>Visibility is addressed in Section 4.1 on page 4.1-96.</p> <p>The USEPA Final Implementation Plan (FIP) requiring FCPP implementation of Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART) addresses the historic emission issues with FCPP in the Four Corners area. The proposed action's conformance with the FIP, including shutdown of Units 1, 2, and 3 and installation of selective catalytic reduction technology on Units 4 and 5 addresses the issues raised in the comment.</p> <p>No change has been made in the Draft EIS.</p>
92.001	Ms.	Heather	Snow		5/13/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Four Corners does not want to prolong for 25 years the operations of a dirty, antiquated coal plant that will add 258 million metric tons of carbon pollution to our atmosphere (the equivalent of 54 MILLION cars).</li> </ul>	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.
92.002	Ms.	Heather	Snow		5/13/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Four Corners is tired of being a dumping ground for air, land and water pollutants associated with power that is shipped out of our region.</li> </ul>	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015. With regard to power being shipped out of the region, as described on page 1-3 of the Draft EIS, six transmission lines extend from the FCPP and provide power to the southwest - in Arizona, New Mexico and Texas.
92.003	Ms.	Heather	Snow		5/13/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The DEIS is deficient in its analysis of the full economic, environmental, and human health costs of this project.</li> </ul>	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
92.004	Ms.	Heather	Snow		5/13/2014	head in the direction of renewable energy.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
93.001	Mr.	Vincent	Yazzie		5/14/2014	<p>Four Corners Power Plant and Utah International were mixing ash with the soil at the Navajo Mine for fertilization in 1972. Transcript from Federal Protection of Indian Resources, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Committee on the Judiciary United States Senate 92nd Congress, First Session on Federal Administrative Protection of Indian Rights and Natural Resources, Part 3, January 3, 1972, page 46 of 137 (pdf) or 754. See link below. Big file. "Senator Kennedy. This morning at Four Corners, the Utah Power Co. told us that it only cost \$200 to level the high and low points. They say that they are going to try to make the peaks and valleys consistent in terms of the landscape and put ash back in for fertilization. They say that this cost approximately \$200 an acre. What do you say to that?" Looks like Utah International was mixing fly ash into the soil for fertilization before they started to bury the ash. A different story that Utah International had authorization to dump the ash into the ground.</p> <p><a href="http://www.navajohopilittlecoloradoriverwatersettlement2012.info/window_rock_hearings_part_3_01031972.pdf">http://www.navajohopilittlecoloradoriverwatersettlement2012.info/window_rock_hearings_part_3_01031972.pdf</a></p>	Thank you for your comment and the information provided. As described on page 2-16 of the Draft EIS, the Navajo Mine accepted coal combustion residues for use in reclamation at the mine between 1971 and 2008.
93.002	Mr.	Vincent	Yazzie		5/14/2014	<p>Contribution of major and minor elements to soils and vegetation by the coal fired Four Corners Power Plant, San Juan Co., New Mexico. H.L. Cannon, V.E. Swanson, USGS, Denver, Colorado, Open-File Report No. 75-170, 1975. page 1(abstract), "In the vicinity of the power plant, the fly ash is currently contributing major and minor elements that are essential to vegetative growth to otherwise deficient soils. The concentrations of potentially harmful minor elements, such as Hg, As, Se, Te, Cd, Be, and Pb, that originate from the power plant drop off rapidly with distance from the stacks and are lower than the average contents in U.S. soils at distances greater than 3 kilometers." It is quite obvious that Utah International mixed the fly ash with the soil for fertilization. Many heavy metals were then added to the soil. Since NTEC assumed responsibilities for BHP and Utah International. NTEC and APS are responsible for restoring the hydrological balance to the power plant area and the mine area. The soil near the power plant needs to be scrapped and stored in a lined pit and covered with rip rap to prevent the heavy metals from entering the San Juan River.</p>	Section 4.5.2.1 of the Draft EIS discusses OSMRE's analysis of the placement of coal combustion residue at the Navajo Mine. This study did not identify any adverse impacts associated with this placement. Section 4.15 of the Draft EIS addresses the disposal of coal combustion residue at the FCPP. Table 4.15-5 provides FCPP Toxic Release Inventory data related to heavy metals. Section 4.15.5 includes OSMRE's recommendations for closure of the ash disposal areas in order to address the potential for off-site contamination. In addition, soil sampling, both shallow and deep, was conducted in support of the EIS. The data showed comparable levels of metals in both shallow and deep samples.
94.001	Ms.	Beth	Estelle		4/17/2014	<p>These plants are a serious source of pollution. I particularly worry about mercury pollution...the contamination of the fish is a terrible loss. I'm also concerned about acid rain and its effect on Mesa Verde and any loss of sky clarity diminishes us. I'd like to see all units shut down and further coal mines avoided.</p>	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015. With regard to mercury pollution, please see Master Response #4, Mercury in Fish in Nearby Lakes. Acid rain and visibility are addressed in Section 4.1, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
94.002	Ms.	Beth	Estelle		4/17/2014	It's time to shift to renewables such as solar and wind with more use of gas (rather than coal) as a bridge to a new future.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives
95.001	Mr.	Harrison	Cly		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
95.002	Mr.	Harrison	Cly		4/22/2014	The pollution from APS, the haze from the power plant is a health issue on the people, the land, and water. The coal ash at Navajo mine was covered with top soil and it is a contamination issue and it is not good reclamation. It is a safety issue.	Thank you for your comment. An evaluation of the potential air quality impacts of the proposed action and alternatives is included in Section 4.1, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS. Health and Safety is addressed in Section 4.17. With regard to placement of coal combustion residue at the Navajo Mine, a summary of OSMRE's evaluation of potential impacts is provided in Section 4.5.2.1 of the Draft EIS.
96.001	Mr.	Joe	Allen		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
96.002	Mr.	Joe	Allen		4/22/2014	It is very important to consider the human health impacts from the power plant/mine operation. The people who live nearby are having lung problems.	Thank you for your comment. Pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarizes the results of the Human Health Risk Assessment performed for the Project. In addition, a discussion of the results of human health risk assessment evaluating potential impacts of the emissions from the Navajo Mine is located on pages 4.17-19 through 4.17-22 of the Draft EIS.
96.003	Mr.	Joe	Allen		4/22/2014	There has been evidence of destruction of sacred sites in the mine area, yet the EIS does not assess these impact very well.	Two programmatic agreements have been developed for the project to address the protection of cultural resources and artifacts. A discussion of the tribal and Section 106 consultation processes through which these programmatic agreements were developed is provided in Section 4.4, Cultural Resources. In addition, a complete summary of all consultation activities to date is provided in Section 5, Consultation and Coordination. OSMRE has been in close coordination with the Navajo Nation Tribal Historic Preservation Officer throughout the EIS and Section 106 process to identify and evaluate impacts to all historic properties, cultural resources, and traditional cultural properties within the project area of potential effect. This work has been conducted with a large Section 106 consulting parties group, as well as direct involvement by the Navajo Nation Tribal Preservation Office.
97.001	Mr.	Justin	Lee		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
97.002	Mr.	Justin	Lee		4/22/2014	At all possible, "PLEASE" make this EIS language in our native tongue so our elderly can understand it.	Please see Master Response #10, Translation of the EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
97.003	Mr.	Justin	Lee		4/22/2014	Enough is enough about the pollution that we put ourselves through every day...health issues, water, plant growth, and land deterioration and other risks.	Thank you for your comment. The Draft EIS addresses public health in Section 4.17, water in Section 4.5, plant growth in Section 4.6, and land deterioration in Section 4.9.
98.001	Mr.	Fabian	Peters		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
99.001	Ms.	Beverly	Maxwell		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
100.001	Ms.	Hazel	James		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
101.001	Mr.	Robert	Tohe		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
102.001		L.	Whisper C.K.		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
103.001	Mr.	Robert	McKinney		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
104.001	Ms.	Aurelia	Begay		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
105.001	Ms.	Lorraine	Claushee		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
106.001	Mr.	Jim	Begay		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
107.001	Ms.	Adella	Begay		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
107.002	Ms.	Adella	Begay		4/22/2014	Many Navajo citizens cannot read a 1500 page plus document. We need informed consent to agree to another years of pollution.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
108.001		Terry	Smith		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
109.001	Mr.	Jerry	Frazier		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
110.001	Mr.	Harvey	Begay		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
111.001	Mr.	Jonathan	Perry		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
112.001	Mr.	Jason	Hotchkiss		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
113.001	Mr.	Dailan	Long		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
114.001	Ms.	Sylvia	Clahchischilli		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
115.001	Mr.	Anthony	Peters		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
116.001	Mr.	Dan	Benally		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
117.001	Mr.	Ed	Becenti		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
118.001	Mr.	Johnathon	Jones		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
119.001		Solito	Becenti		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
120.001	Ms.	Connie	Claushee		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
121.001	Ms.	Lula	Bedah		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
122.001	Ms.	Lawendra	Atcitty		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
123.001		Shaunacy	Becenti		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day comment period extension for the Four Corners Power Plan and Navajo Mine EIS.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
124.001	Mr.	Gary	Benally		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
125.001	Mr.	Arnold	Sells		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
126.001	Mr.	Roger	Deale		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
127.001	Ms.	Vernita	Benallie		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
128.001	Mr.	Percy	Deale		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments. The EIS is too complicated to understand. There should be better communication provided to the Navajo public.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
128.002	Mr.	Percy	Deale		4/22/2014	It should also include a study on health and water impacts.	Thank you for your comment. Pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarizes the results of the Human Health Risk Assessment performed for the Project. In addition, a discussion of the results of human health risk assessment evaluating potential impacts of the emissions from the Navajo Mine is located on pages 4.17-19 through 4.17-22 of the Draft EIS. Water resources are addressed in Section 4.5 of the Draft EIS.
129.001		Boola	Youngbear		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
130.001		Sweetie	Marbury	Mayor, City of Durango	4/28/2014	Due to the scope and breadth of this DEIS, the Durango City Council requests that OSMRE consider extending the 60-day public comment period.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
131.001	Ms.	Rachel	Jankowitz	New Mexico Game and Fish Department	4/28/2014	It appears that the entire project area is on the property of the Navajo Reservation. The Department has no jurisdiction or authority for the wildlife resources on Indian reservations or property. Continued operation of the Four Corners Power Plant could potentially impact New Mexico wildlife through air quality and aquatic deposition of airborne contaminants. However since the plant has, or will have, recently implemented an EPA-approved Federal Implementation Plan for Best Available Retrofit Technology, we have no comment on this issue.	Thank you for your comment. While the majority of the project is located on the Navajo Reservation, segments of the subject transmission lines extend outside of Tribal Trust Lands into New Mexico. Potential effects to vegetation and wildlife in this area was addressed in Section 4.6 and 4.7 of the Draft EIS.
132.001	Mr.	Henry	Barber	Dine Medicine Men's Association, Incorporated	5/6/2014	An extreme concerned issue of a 1,500 page Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) released by the Office of Surface Mining (OSM) presented before the DMMAI meeting at Tees Nos Pos, Arizona on May 04, 2014 which has been considered and concluded to request 60 days extension beyond May 27, 2014.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
133.001	Ms.	Nancy	Holland		5/10/2014	I realize we have more dust in this part of the world, however, the humongous brown cloud that usually hangs over Shiprock and Farmington is quite visible and especially from above Bloomfield.	Thank you for your comment. Visibility is addressed in Section 4.1, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS.
133.002	Ms.	Nancy	Holland		5/10/2014	I believe in the long run incorporating those renewable features into the power plants capabilities will have huge dividends in money and the quality of life for everyone.	Thank you for your comment. With regard to renewable energy, please see Master Response #2.
134.001	Ms.	Jan	Holt		5/11/2014	It is time to retire coal mining and use in the Four Corners and look towards renewables.	Thank you for your comment. With regard to renewable energy, please see Master Response #2.
134.002	Ms.	Jan	Holt		5/11/2014	Having fled the Front Range to escape the horrible air pollution there, I find that it is bad here too. problems of health and thus detrimental effects on our economy.	Thank you for your comment. Pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarizes the results of the Human Health Risk Assessment performed for the Project. In addition, a discussion of the results of human health risk assessment evaluating potential impacts of the emissions from the Navajo Mine is located on pages 4.17-19 through 4.17-22 of the Draft EIS.
134.003	Ms.	Jan	Holt		5/11/2014	I don't believe that the DEIS document sufficiently covers the negative problems that continued coal mining and use would bring.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
135.001	Mr.	Leigh	Waggoner	St. Barnabas Church	5/14/2014	The air my elderly parishioners breathe is often hazy with particulate matter from the 4 Corners Power Plant. They have respiratory issues that are compromised by our bad air...Coal cannot be a part of that picture.	Thank you for your comment. Air quality is addressed in Section 4.1 of the Draft EIS. In addition, pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarize the results of the human health risk assessment performed for the project.
136.001	Ms.	Tricia	Zuber		5/15/2014	Coal Power Plants are a major contributor to the warming of the earth.... I am worried about what will happen if we don't move towards renewable energy.	Thank you for your comment. Climate Change is addressed in Section 4.2 of the Draft EIS, as well as in Section 4.18, Cumulative Impacts. With regard to renewable energy alternatives, please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives.
136.002	Ms.	Tricia	Zuber		5/15/2014	I feel the DEIS is deficient in its analysis of the full economic, environmental and human health costs of the project.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
137.001	Ms.	Christine	Benally		5/16/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
138.001	Ms.	Lilah	Slaughter		5/16/2014	The air humans inhale can be toxic with coal dust pollution, causing coal worker's pneumoconiosis or chronic pulmonary obstructive disorder. Both of these diseases cause respiratory issues and potential premature death. The environmental and health blows dealt out by the Four Corners Coal-Powered Plant greatly outweigh the few benefits provided by keeping the plant open for another twenty seven years.	Thank you for your comment. Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS addresses potential impacts with regard to Health and Safety, including worker safety. Pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarize the human health risk assessment conducted for the project.
138.002	Ms.	Lilah	Slaughter		5/16/2014	The next two years will provide adequate time for the Four Corners to make a switch to renewable energy sources and for workers to find new jobs, even potentially in the fields of renewable energy.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives, and Master Response #3, Analyze Alternatives with Shorter Lease Terms

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
138.003	Ms.	Lilah	Slaughter		5/16/2014	In the interest of the environment, our health, and even the economy, the No Action plan should be followed.	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.
139.001	Mr.	Quinn	Luthy		5/16/2014	This power plant deserves no more than a five year license renewal (time for other energy development), and it should be taken down and replaced with safer, newer forms of energy producing technology.	Please see Master Response #3, Analyze Alternatives with Shorter Lease Terms
139.002	Mr.	Quinn	Luthy		5/16/2014	This plant harms the environment and the air quality of northern New Mexico and Arizona, as well as the Southern Parts of Colorado and Utah. This plant expects 200,000,000 tons of carbon emissions over the next 25 years, which would harm both the air quality and climate of the surrounding region.	Thank you for your comment. Potential impacts with regard to air quality and climate change are addressed in Section 4.1 and 4.2 of the Draft EIS, respectively.
139.003	Mr.	Quinn	Luthy		5/16/2014	We have much safer forms of electricity. Wind and solar power require a perfect environment to operate 24/7, hydroelectric power needs specific sites and nuclear power can be dangerous. The best renewable source of electricity lies beneath our feet, in the Earth's geothermal electricity. We can adopt power plants much like those in Iceland. Iceland relies on fossil fuels for only 15% of its total electric demands. In the Four Corner Region, one needs only to drill 300 feet down to get enough heat energy to heat their house and one needs only drill 500 feet down to boil water, which creates steam, which can turn a turbine, much like a coal plant. Such plants are cheap and can provide electricity for a very long time.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives
139.004	Mr.	Quinn	Luthy		5/16/2014	Solar is a very stable alternative as the Southern Colorado and Northern New Mexico areas report an average of 325 days of sunshine a year. Batteries regulate power for darker days.	Thank you for your comment. Solar energy was considered as a potential alternative in Section 3.3.1 of the Draft EIS.
139.005	Mr.	Quinn	Luthy		5/16/2014	If a 25 year license is awarded to the Four Corners the air quality of the surrounding region will plummet, harming the extensive tourism economy of the area, we will experience smog such as that in Los Angeles on a daily basis, and the St. Vincent hospital (a major source of jobs, and money) will lose its reputation. All of the above consequences are a result of the license renewal.	Section 4.1 of the Draft EIS addresses potential air quality impacts, Section 4.16 addresses impacts to recreation. OSMRE is considering all alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS and will issue its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in spring 2015.
140.001	Mr.	Tim	Thomas		5/18/2014	The Federal government has not fully and adequately assessed the environmental impacts of a continued coal-fired plant operation in terms of consulting the Fish and Wildlife service, getting information on the health impact of Navaho and Hopi nation workers and residents living nearby, and the impact to the air and water quality of the region (& it's inhabitants) that the estimated 250+ million metric tons of carbon pollution will effect if continued to operate for another 25 years.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis. With regards to consulting with the US Fish and Wildlife Service, OSMRE began informal consultation with the Service in November 2013 and formal consultation in summer 2014, in accordance with ESA Regulations.
140.002	Mr.	Tim	Thomas		5/18/2014	The Federal government needs to help promote cleaner energy alternatives to coal and not continue to support coal plants that the	With regard to alternatives to coal, please see Master Response #2, Alternatives.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						utilities profiting from these operations are not paying the true costs of the effects on the health and welfare of the populace and region.	Pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarize the results of the Human Health Risk Assessment performed for the Project. In addition, a discussion of the results of human health risk assessment evaluating potential impacts of the emissions from the Navajo Mine is located on pages 4.17-19 through 4.17-22 of the Draft EIS.  A quantitative analysis of the social cost of carbon (SCC) has been added to the Final EIS in Section 4.2. The Draft EIS considered the SCC in a qualitative manner, but did not quantify the effects. Subsequent to issuance of the Draft EIS, CEQ published Draft Guidance on climate change analysis (CEQ 2014), in which CEQ indicates that emissions monetization is not required in every project-level NEPA analysis. Nonetheless, OSMRE determined that a quantitative analysis would be included in the Final EIS, following the Interagency Working Group Methods. The results of the SCC analysis do not change the conclusions or the findings of level of significance for the Climate Change issue; however, the analysis has been added to provide additional context to OSMRE's decision.
140.003	Mr.	Tim	Thomas		5/18/2014	Adequate time and public discourse be allowed to further study the issue and alternatives. As the draft EIS stands now, I would NOT favor a continuation of the FCPP lease, nor an expansion of it's operation of the Pinabete mine. I would favor a phase out of the coal powered plant over the next 10 years.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period and Master Response #3, Analyze Alternatives with Shorter Lease Term
141.001	Ms.	Christine	Benally		5/19/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
142.001	Ms.	Helen	Clah		4/22/2014	This is a request for a 60-day extension for the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine project. 60 days is not sufficient time to read and comprehend a 1500+ pages document and make informed comments.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
143.001	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley	Dine CARE	5/20/2014	I want to know why there was no representative from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) present at these meetings?	OSMRE requested attendance of all cooperating agencies at the public meetings, including EPA. Whether or not to attend is at the discretion of each individual agency. Cooperating agencies that did attend meetings included BIA, USACE, and the Navajo Nation.
143.002	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley	Dine CARE	5/20/2014	The number of poster boards and the number of OSM staff and consultants at these meetings was overwhelming and intimidating to the general public. Unlike previous and familiar participation processes hosted by the EPA, the poster board format presented by OSM was academic and deflecting engagement by the general public. Aside from only English-speaking staff and consultants, one was invited to provide a deposition to a recorder, setup in the corner of the room. This type of venue isolates participants from hearing one another's 'real-life experiences' – which could educate the general public to consider possible health impacts and concerns.	Please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
143.003	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley	Dine CARE	5/20/2014	Another observation we endured was the fact that OSM staff and consultants were not fully prepared to answer questions and concerns regarding the EIS document.	Please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format
143.004	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley	Dine CARE	5/20/2014	In addition, there was one incident that occurred at the Farmington OSM public meeting, where an OSM representative approached a Navajo woman and accused her of being with Diné C.A.R.E. and ranting to her about posting misinformation on Facebook about OSM.	All OSMRE representatives acted in a professional manner at all times during the public meetings. No accusations were made to anyone at any time. The OSMRE representatives were particularly accommodating to the Dine Care representatives who set up a table at the various public meetings. No change to the Draft EIS.
144.001	Ms.	Kathy	Helms	Gallup Independent	5/14/2014	Some members of the public raised concerns that the open house--style of meeting actually limits public comment. Navajo grassroots group Diné citizens Against Ruining our Environment criticized the federal government for a process that is "discouraging community input on a study with glaring gaps on issues such as health, climate change, environmental justice, and renewable energy alternatives."	Please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format
144.002	Ms.	Kathy	Helms	Gallup Independent	5/14/2014	Colleen Cooley of Diné CARE said it appeared that OSM staff and consultants were limited, in their familiarity with the study.	NEPA mandates that the Federal Government "utilize a systematic, interdisciplinary approach which will insure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts in planning and in decision-making which may have an impact on man's environment". As such, a single OSMRE representative cannot be expected to know all the technical minutiae of a particular resource section. Many environmental professionals can speak to each resource in a general manner; and in cases of greater detail we referred to the Draft EIS and/or the person who conducted the analysis. As such, during the public hearings, staff would often walk the public to appropriate staff to answer particular questions the public posed. No change to the Draft EIS.
144.003	Ms.	Kathy	Helms	Gallup Independent	5/14/2014	Sylvia Clahchischilli of Teec Nos Pos said she believes the change in format is a deliberate move by OSM, although the agency stated that it was to, accommodate individuals who fear public speaking.	Please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format
144.004	Ms.	Kathy	Helms	Gallup Independent	5/14/2014	Energy Minerals Law Center attorney Travis Stills, who attended the Durango open house, said the format eliminates the community's ability to educate each other and engage in the process. "There's no ability for real substantive response. ... I think this is a deliberate shift.	Please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format
144.005	Ms.	Kathy	Helms	Gallup Independent	5/14/2014	Although federal agency officials and private consultants fielded questions from the public in front of colorful boards explaining specific portions of the environmental, report, those questions and comments do not get recorded for use in the environmental review.	Each member of the public who attended the meetings was informed upon entrance and sign-in that two court reporters were available to record oral comments and comment sheets were provided on tables for members of the public to submit their comments. Attendees who spoke with staff at information boards were listened to and encouraged to formally record their comments in either written or oral format.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
145.001		Cindiman	Pinneke		5/20/2014	The reason I support this [NO] action is because we need to change to renewable sources of energy NOW. Our air quality is poor, public health is at risk, and climate	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015. With regard to renewable energy alternatives, please see Master Response #2.
146.001	Mr.	Gabriel	Bradley		5/20/2014	BHP provided many jobs to Native Americans in the four corners area, which in return gave them the opportunities to start their lives and families.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
147.001	Ms.	Melody	Coyner	Farmington City Council, City Attorney's Office	5/20/2014	Attached please find a copy of Resolution No. 2014-1504 in support of the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine Project adopted by the Farmington City Council on May 20, 2014.	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.
148.001	Mr.	Randy	McKnight		5/20/2014	She has observed a frightening number of children in this area with asthma and even has a child in her kindergarten class being treated for cancer. We've been told by a doctor in the area that cancer rates in the four corners are way above the national average. We have seen first hand the devastating health and environmental consequence's these coal plants have caused.	Thank you for your comment. Health and Safety is addressed in Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS. Specifically, pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarize the results of the human health risk assessment performed for the project.
148.002	Mr.	Randy	McKnight		5/20/2014	With any extension, it should be minimal and tied to a mandatory 50% or higher of renewable energy produced from the power plant.	Please see Master Response #3, Analyze Alternatives with Shorter Lease Terms and Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives.
149.001		Chris	Penner		5/21/2014	One of the obvious needs of our country's future is in stable employment.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
150.001	Ms.	Maggie	Bowes		5/21/2014	The Four Corners area has been a dumping ground for contaminated air, polluted water and land that has been associated with the coal power from the Four Corners Power Plant and the Navajo Mine.	Thank you for your comment. Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
150.002	Ms.	Maggie	Bowes		5/21/2014	It is time to change the direction of coal power to renewable energy and gas which can support jobs, clean water and clean air.	Thank you for your comment. Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives
151.001	Mr.	Robert	Toledo		5/23/2014	To allow these companies to go away would hurt more people then it would help the small majority that protest them. We need to protect the jobs that San Juan County residents have with the mining and power plant company's, there is nothing to replace it with.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
152.001	Mr.	Zachary	Larsen		5/21/2014	It is however, obvious that the Four Corners Generating station is quite old and outdated, not just in age, but the visible particulates coming from the smoke stacks are much greater in comparison to the newer and cleaner PNM power plant. Improvements to this can and should be made, but to deny the necessary permits would affect thousands of people in the community who are able to work, live and be productive members of the community all due to the presence of the mine and power plant, including myself and my family.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS. A discussion of visibility and particulate matter emissions is provided in Section 4.1 of the Draft EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
153.001		K.	Leroy		5/23/2014	We need to find another way to burn coal for Energy, either Solar produced electricity or a Coal Liquefaction process must be developed. By the time 2041 comes around greenhouse gases may have rendered our environment and way of life almost unlivable. BART and proposed Action Alternatives at any Coal fired power plants are only band-aids to an already contaminated and festering open wound to our Environment caused by power plant operations since the 1960's.	Thank you for your comment. Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives
153.002		K.	Leroy		5/23/2014	Haze is only one line of the writing on the wall in terms of the negative way we burn coal today. Health problems currently evident by increased cancers among neighboring citizens of power plants is just the start of the health problems as a result of breathing dirty air and contaminants that we cannot see.	Thank you for your comment. Health and Safety is addressed in Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS. Specifically, pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarize the results of the human health risk assessment performed for the project. Air emissions and visibility are addressed in Section 4.1 of the Draft EIS.
153.003		K.	Leroy		5/23/2014	Change CCR to be classed as Hazardous Waste and to be treated accordingly. Please maintain Rules and Regulations of no seepage of surface water from permit area unto no-permit area, now and past 2041.	The ruling regarding the classification of Coal combustion residue is under the authority of EPA, not OSMRE. Similarly, surface discharge at FCPP is regulated under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit under the authority of the EPA and discussed in Section 4.5 of the Draft EIS. Section 4.15 of the Draft EIS discusses the regulatory framework with regard to CCR and includes recommendations for the disposal of CCR at FCPP.
153.004		K.	Leroy		5/23/2014	If an Archaeological Resource happens to be in the way please spend extra time and your dollars to go around it, if possible.	Two programmatic agreements have been developed for the project to address the protection of cultural resources and artifacts, including avoidance of impacts.
153.005		K.	Leroy		5/23/2014	Fish and Wildlife Service has studies which show 4CPP is in the middle of Golden Eagle migration paths, which covers 4 states. Please ensure reclamation is geared towards saving Golden Eagle habitat and their prey, animals' habitat. I see Peabody's Reclamation areas has plants that livestock don't eat! As a rancher I see this as a Red Flag and needs to be fixed, no invasive or non-native plants are to be used in Reclamation. Please spend the extra dollars to re-claim area back to an original undisturbed state.	Golden eagle habitat and presence is described and evaluated in Section 4.8 of the Draft EIS. As stated on page 3-13 of the Draft EIS, the reclaimed areas are revegetated to ensure that the land is capable of supporting the post-mining land use, which is designated as livestock grazing and wildlife habitat....BNCC has developed seed mixes that utilize up to 21 different native plant species; 10 grasses, 4 forbs, and 7 shrub species that are all native to the San Juan Basin.
153.006		K.	Leroy		5/23/2014	What mainly affects Hopi in the EIS process is the Eldorado Transmission Line. Hopi settled the ROW issue but we feel APS no longer wants to service Hopi. We've asked for a 15 mile addition to our existing service line but APS hasn't positively responded, it was a negotiation item that was denied by APS. All the government entities within the DOI must pay attention to HOPIS' needs not just Navajo.	As a formal Cooperating Agency in the NEPA process, the Hopi have been afforded the same level of involvement as the Navajo Nation, which also serves as Cooperating Agency. However, any negotiations between APS and the Hopi are beyond the scope of the EIS.
154.001	Ms.	Kate	Niles		5/25/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
155.001	Ms.	Cherry	Miloe		5/26/2014	I am against the 25-year lease amendment. A five- or ten-year lease is sufficient and hopefully the plant will be replaced with wind and solar power in this area by then.	Thank you for your comment. Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
155.002	Ms.	Cherry	Miloe		5/26/2014	solar and wind power set up in the local area, should be permitted to use these transmission lines.	The Arizona Corporation Commission and New Mexico Public Regulations Commission have oversight regarding distribution of power onto transmission lines. Evaluation of different uses of the subject transmission lines is outside the scope of this EIS.
155.003	Ms.	Cherry	Miloe		5/26/2014	The renewal of the Navajo Mine's existing SMCRA permit for Areas I, II, III and portions of IV North of the Navajo Mine Lease area need to be re-examined, with an unbiased group doing a environment impact report, along with a study on the impact on cultural areas and people currently living in these areas.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis. Impacts to cultural resources are evaluated in Section 4.4 of the Draft EIS. Health and Safety is addressed in Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS. Specifically, pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarize the Human Health Risk Assessment conducted for the project.
155.004	Ms.	Cherry	Miloe		5/26/2014	The new 5,569-acre mine area should not be approved. The environmental impact, the cultural impact, the removal of people's homes in this area and the amount of ash that will occur in this area is too detrimental for the request for a large mining area to be approved.	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.
155.005	Ms.	Cherry	Miloe		5/26/2014	I live in SW Colorado and I am tired of the air being polluted due to coal mine plants in Arizona and New Mexico. Our fish are full of mercury. Our lungs are full of that and other pollutants. I want all coal power plants to be closed, or at least have their pollutants filtered as much as possible.	Thank you for your comment. Section 4.18 of the Draft EIS addresses cumulative impacts, including consideration of the 17 coal-fired power plants in the region.
156.001	Mr.	Simon	Blueeyes		5/26/2014	Presently it benefits the local communities directly and indirectly through small business	Thank you for your comment. A full discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
157.001	Ms.	Diana	Speer		5/27/2014	Mercury is a natural contaminate of coal which is released into the air when coal is burned. Already Navajo Lake and Vallecito Lake in CO have Mercury Advisory's limiting fish consumption to one fish per month.	Please see Master Response #4, Mercury deposition and mercury in fish in nearby lakes.
157.002	Ms.	Diana	Speer		5/27/2014	Why is the EPA not involved in this study, with their Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants?	EPA is a cooperating agency for this NEPA process and has been involved in the preparation of the Draft and Final EIS, as well as the development of separate studies conducted to analyze potential impacts of the project.
157.003	Ms.	Diana	Speer		5/27/2014	Coal and Radiation are safer remaining in the ground. Once in the air and water they both enter our lungs and our food leading to chronic and fatal diseases. It's very expensive, and not covered by Medicare to go through the dozens of Chelation I.V.s to remove mercury from it's myriad of storage sites in the body. Coal dust exposure leads to black lung disease. My father mined coal in Appalachia. His was not a good death. Alzheimer's is on the rise, La Plata County already has a higher cancer rate than other counties in CO. Please, if you must approve this project, at least be humane to those of us who live downwind of the plant and apply the most stringent of the best technology.	Please see Master Response #12, OSMRE and BIA should place conditions on lease and SMCRA permit. Radiation is not associated with the proposed project and is outside the scope of this EIS. Health and Safety are addressed in Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS, specifically pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarize the Human Health Risk Assessment conducted for the project.
158.001	Mr.	Dale	Horvath		5/27/2014	It is KEY to providing for economic development and self-determination for the Navajo Tribe	Thank you for your comment. A full discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
159.001	Mr.	Michael	King		5/27/2014	I have witnessed a rapid industrialization and increased emissions of air pollutants in the past decades as a result of rapid development of oil, gas, and coal resources in the region. This increase in energy development has brought the potential for additional air and water pollution, where human health, welfare and natural ecosystems already have a toxic legacy.	Thank you for your comment. Section 4.18 of the Draft EIS provides an evaluation of cumulative impacts, including other energy projects in the region.
159.002	Mr.	Michael	King		5/27/2014	In conclusion, Cooperative efforts from Federal, State, and Tribal air management agencies are need to address feasible regional emission reductions needed to provide adequate human health and environmental protection. I believe a more sustainable approach to energy development can be achieved through collaborative work. Incorporating the sciences, technology, and cultures into environmental protection is essential in order to encourage sustainable industrial development while meeting socioeconomic needs and ultimately protecting human health, welfare and the environment.	Thank you for your comment. The EIS process included three multi-agency and tribal participants, as follows: 1) Cooperating agency group, 2) an endangered species act group, and 3) a national historic preservation act group. The intent was, in part, that expressed in this comment.
160.001	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley	Dine CARE	5/28/2014	We understand OSM involved the public through a series of public meetings on and off the Navajo Nation. However, the poster style format with 20+ OSM staff and consultants was considered an intimidating and inadequate process by the Diné community members who attended some of the meetings....The hearing format should be conducive to allow people to voice their questions and concerns regarding the DEIS, in this way sharing their 'real-life' experiences with each other.	Please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format
161.001	Mr.	Tyrian	Clitso		5/27/2014	If the mine should shut down, 500+ local jobs would be lost, with the US economy already in shambles, it would devastate our local economy.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
162.001	Mr.	Vincent	Yazzie		5/10/2014	My mom, Annie P. Walker suffered an acute respiratory distress at the North Security Gate of the Navajo Mine on May 7, 2014 around 4:30 pm... I was inside the trailer talking with security while my mom was being exposed to some coal emissions from Four Corners Power Plant... Design of the SCR would not be engineered correctly or be inadequate to handle the extra NOx. Also there would be more ammonia produced. Leaks have to be found and emissions measured at the furnace.	The mine conducts fugitive dust monitoring, and the EIS conducted specific analyses to address this issue, and did not identify a major impact. The SCR design must meet the performance standards set by the FIP for BART, and be enforceable by the US EPA.
163.001	Ms.	Eldrice	Mansfield		4/30/2014	The only concern for the villages is that when Hopis get the eagles and hawks for ceremonial purposes on Navajo Lands they get shot or have graffiti on the walls. That is not right. Also, we get our greens' furns' For our ceremony they have the gate closed. Is the sacred place so they will open it up.	Thank you for your comment. Traditional cultural properties and cultural resources are discussed in Section 4.4 of the EIS.
164.001	Mr.	Elgean	Joshevana		4/30/2014	The two volumes of the Draft EIS contains a lot of technical terminology, including high numbers that are indescribably in Hopi. For example, what is the Hopi Terms for an acre feet of water? Our counting in numbers is limited and does not include "millions" or hundreds of thousands, which makes it difficult for many older Hopi to understand such information contained in the Draft EIS is almost impossible to translate into Hopi.	Please see Master Response #10, Translation of the EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
165.001	Mr.	Percy	Deal		4/30/2014	I am deeply concern about the FCPP and mine same as Peabody and NGS. There been no health impact on people that even been done at both mines and power plants. There must to be one, the same applies for water.	Thank you for your comment. For clarification, this NEPA process addresses only the FCPP and Navajo Mine. NGS and Peabody Mine are under evaluation through a separate NEPA process being led by the Bureau of Reclamation.  Health and Safety are addressed in Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS. Specifically, pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarize the results of the Human Health Risk Assessment conducted for the project.
166.001	Mr.	John	McHenry		5/1/2014	Taking into consideration the jobs created and the economic (positive) impact on the whole area, I think the mine and the power plant should be in operation for in the future.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
167.001	Ms.	Tyra	Welch		5/1/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment
168.001	Mr.	William R.	Jobin	Colorado Valley Ecologists		<p>Having examined the Environmental Impact Assessment for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine Complex, I am appalled by its deficiencies regarding emission into our atmosphere from the burning of coal in the plant. Particles of soot emitted from the plan can cause major health and environmental impacts throughout the Four Corners Region. Until the emission of particulate matter is measures and analyzed, the EIA is deficient and should be rejected.</p> <p>My analysis indicates that the EIS fails to deal with the major source of health problems from coal-fired power plants; emissions of particles of soot and other combustion products. Fine particles from burning coal are linked to premature mortality, respiratory and cardiovascular disease, and emergency hospital admissions for asthma and bronchitis. Coarse particles are also important in decreasing visibility in our contaminated atmosphere. For this reason the USEPA has imposed new stringent Air Quality Standards for fine particles, added to the older standards for coarse particles. The important of interstate regulation of these particles in our air was upheld in a recent Supreme Court decision on April 29, 2-14. Thus the current and projected concentrations of both fine and coarse particles must be evaluated for the FCPP before we make an assessment of its health and environmental impacts, and renew the lease.</p>	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis. Impacts to health and safety are addressed in Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS. Specifically, pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarize the results of the human health risk assessment conducted for the project.
169.001	Mr.	Dan	Randolph		5/3/2014	Morgan Lake is a known ground water mound source. Concern is lack of groundwater monitoring north of Morgan lake between lake and S.J. River. Also, lack of groundwater monitoring between Morgan lake and Area I/Area II of mine where CCR was buried. Without this data, the hydrology of the northern part of the FCPP/N. Mine complex is woefully inadequate	Thank you for your comment. Morgan Lake is a known groundwater mound; as discussed on page 4.5-33 and shown in Figure 4.5-8 of the Draft EIS surface water quality in the lake meets the Navajo Nation EPA standards for designated beneficial uses. As groundwater beneath the lake would be recharged by surface water from the lake, the quality of the groundwater would be similar to the surface water. Furthermore, during groundwater transport, any elevated concentrations of constituents of concern would be diluted to lower concentrations.  With regard to groundwater monitoring in Areas I and II of the mine, monitoring wells are located on Figure 4.5-2 and have also been added to Figure 4.5-1.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
169.002	Mr.	Dan	Randolph		5/3/2014	The biological assessment/opinion should be included in the Draft EIS so the public can have critical information.	The final Biological Assessment/Biological Opinion has been appended to the Final EIS.
170.001	Ms.	Corrine T.	Yazzie		5/3/2014	The Navajo Reservation really does only benefit from the money received, plus employs man, and create dollars for nearby businesses, overall the power plant and Navajo Mine provides/spreads wealth.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
171.001	Mr.	Jack	Turner	LPEA, board of directors	5/3/2014	Economic. WHAT IS THE WHOLESALE COST (of electricity) IMPACTS WITH THE EXPANSIONS OF THE MINE?	Please see Master Response #13, Cost of Electricity.
172.001	Ms.	Alvina	Yellowman		5/3/2014	Because of this, people's have jobs. No mine is no jobs.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
173.001	Ms.	Kelly	Polites		5/3/2014	It has become quite clear that what you are doing is poisoning people, animals, and the environment. I see the smoke and grime in the air on a nearly every day.	The draft EIS addressed issues related to toxicity and other environmental effects.
173.002	Ms.	Kelly	Polites		5/3/2014	There are more infants, youth, and seniors with respiration disease.	Thank you for your comment. Health and Safety is addressed in Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS. Specifically, pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarize the results of the Human Health Risk Assessment conducted for the project.
173.003	Ms.	Kelly	Polites		5/3/2014	Furthermore, what you are doing is going to bankrupt the Navajo Tribe and plunge minority further into even further into poverty.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics, including tribal revenue, is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS. Section 4.11 addresses environmental justice.
174.001	Mr.	Bill	Flint	Koveva	5/3/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
175.001	Ms.	Heather	Erb		5/3/2014	There are enormous climate change implications because of our continued reliance on coal power as well as air and water quality factors that affect the whole four corners populations be they human or animal.	Thank you for your comment. Climate Change is addressed in Section 4.2 of the Draft EIS, as well as in Section 4.18, Cumulative Impacts. Air Quality is addressed in Section 4.1 and Water Resources is addressed in Section 4.5.
175.002	Ms.	Heather	Erb		5/3/2014	The other enormous implication of this plant and the mine is the economic injustice of placing a dirty polluting plant among the poorest, hire the workers to reclaim the land and use the reclaimed but then useful land to build solar farms – the transmission lines already exist. Jobs created by clean energy are good for the local economies and better for the whole 4 corners environment.	Thank you for your comments. Environmental justice is addressed in Section 4.11 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, the proposed project involves continued operation of an existing power plant on land that is leased from the Navajo Nation, not the siting of a new power plant. With regard to renewable energy, please see Master Response #2, Renewable Alternatives.
176.001	Mr.	James T.	Lynch		5/3/2014	2.) Nearly 75% of the green house gases will continue and nearly 40% of the mercury – the mercury will add to the illegal public commons trust taking	These issues are in compliance with the best available technologies available at coal-fired power plants, and were the subject of a recent EPA action establishing BART for FCPP.
176.002	Mr.	James T.	Lynch		5/3/2014	4.) Concentrated solar power or CSP has not specifically identified as an alternative action.	Concentrated solar power is addressed on page 3-50 of the Draft EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
177.001	Mr.	Shiloh Vincent	Craig		5/3/2014	Perhaps create a sector in this clarifying the long run commitment to the after effects of mining/energy production...After all when things cease to be profitable often the commitments of safety, impact stop.	As described in Section 3.2.1.1, a component of the proposed project is reclamation of the mined areas. A description of reclamation is provided on page 2-15: OMSRE's reclamation requirements are specified in 30 U.S.C. 1265 Section 515. BNCC's past reclamation efforts have been successful based on OSMRE review; however, in 2010, OSMRE found that BNCC's rate of reclamation was inadequate. BNCC developed a plan to improve the rate of contemporaneous reclamation in response, and the plan was subsequently approved by OSMRE. Since then, the prescribed rate of contemporaneous reclamation has been met. In 2008, in accordance with OSMRE recommendations, BNCC expanded the use of geomorphic restoration approaches. This design principle uses fewer hard-engineered structures for erosion control, and instead uses design measures that better mimic natural erosion and deposition processes.  Following shut-down of the FCPP, as described on page 3-32, the Plant would discontinue operation and the site would be decommissioned in accordance with the requirements of the 1960 and 1966 leases and existing Section 323 ROW grants for the plant site.
178.001	Ms.	Julie	Kostuch		5/3/2014	Electric power by burning coal is outdated and facilitates a status quo that contribute to the destruction of our environment and to climate change.	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.
178.002	Ms.	Julie	Kostuch		5/3/2014	I am concerned about the increase of respiratory and health issues in the region, particularly among native American youth.	Thank you for your comment. Health and Safety is addressed in Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS. Specifically, pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarize the results of the Human Health Risk Assessment conducted for the project.
178.003	Ms.	Julie	Kostuch		5/3/2014	I am concerned about air quality for all residents of the four corners area.	Thank you for your comment. Air quality is addressed in Section 4.1 of the Draft EIS.
178.004	Ms.	Julie	Kostuch		5/3/2014	I am also concerned about visibility in our beautiful national treasure such as the grand canyon and mesa verde.	Thank you for your comment. Visibility is addressed in Section 4.1, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS.
178.005	Ms.	Julie	Kostuch		5/3/2014	It is time for our nation to show global leadership in the move towards renewable energy. The abundance of sunshine and wind is huge potential for changing our dependence on fuel that harms our planet, health and the well-being of all life.	Thank you for your comment. Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives
178.006	Ms.	Julie	Kostuch		5/3/2014	In my drives to Farmington and shiprock, I see, first hand, the significant pollutants as a result of coal-generated power. In 22 years living in the area, quality of air in the high county has deteriorated and the climate has been erratic.	Thank you for your comment. Air quality and climate change are addressed in Section 4.1 and 4.2 of the Draft EIS, respectively.
179.001	Ms.	Beth	Estelle		5/3/2014	My main concern is mercury pollution as it has contaminated the lakes in SW Colorado (and NW NM and NE AZ) making us afraid to eat our fish.	Please see Master Response #4, Mercury deposition and mercury in fish in nearby lakes.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
179.002	Ms.	Beth	Estelle		5/3/2014	Perhaps more effort (for now) would be toward using gas rather than coal until we can change to more clean alternative energies	Conversion of FCPP to a natural gas plant is addressed in Section 3.3.1 of the Draft EIS. With regard to renewable alternatives, please see Master Response #2.
179.003	Ms.	Beth	Estelle		5/3/2014	I am also concerned about acid rain hazy skies and global warming.	Thank you for your comment. Air quality and climate change are addressed in Section 4.1 and 4.2 of the Draft EIS, respectively.
180.001	Mr.	Larry	Motteshard		5/3/2014	The majority of employees donate to CFS (united and Navajo Way) to help those in their communities that are less fortunate.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
181.001	Mr.	Jason	Hotchkiss		5/3/2014	Cultural resources: Need to have community member approved NAGPRA representative on the site at all times for any new ground disturbance.	Two programmatic agreements have been developed for the project to address the protection of cultural resources and artifacts. A discussion of the tribal and Section 106 consultation processes through which these programmatic agreements were developed is provided in Section 4.4, Cultural Resources. In addition, a complete summary of all consultation activities to date is provided in Section 5, Consultation and Coordination. The programmatic agreements address monitoring on-site during ground disturbance.
182.001	Mr.	Jason	Hotchkiss		5/3/2014	Apparently data for the last 50 years was either not used or ignored when assessing impact. It is a coal mine there is significant impact in every category	Please see Master Response #14, Baseline Conditions
183.001	Mr.	Jason	Hotchkiss		5/3/2014	This NEPA process does not adequately respond to individual comments offered during this public comment period. Technically that makes the public comment period invalid and illegal	Volume 3 of the Final EIS includes responses to all of the comments received during the public review period of the Draft EIS.
184.001	Mr.	Jason	Hotchkiss		5/3/2014	The mine has been in violation of the clean water act throughout it's existence. How can anyone expect it to be enforced on Chaco Wash, San Juan River and all area lakes and subsequent streams?	As described in Section 4.5.1, the Navajo Mine operates under an Industrial NPDES permit. In addition, the USACE is considering a Section 404 Individual Permit for the proposed action. The statement "A review of EPA records also verified that BNCC and APS have no recorded NPDES permit violations (EPA 2013f)" has been revised as follows: "A review of EPA records also verified that no violations occurred under permit NM0000019 and one violation is recorded for BNCC under permit NN0028193 for non-compliance with discharge limits for total suspended solids and total iron for discharge which occurred between October and December 2013. Reporting violations have been recorded for the subsequent quarters. No enforcement actions are reported to date (EPA 2013f)."
185.001	Mr.	Jason	Hotchkiss		5/3/2014	Reclamation: Please provide proof that the reclamation photo's featured in the presentation are from actual reclaimed sites.	The photo credits were cited, and are provided to illustrate the concept of reclamation.
186.001	Mr.	Jason	Hotchkiss		5/3/2014	Requesting a sixty day extension to thoroughly study the draft EIS. Also, requesting that the draft EIS be made available in Navajo, Hopi and Ute.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period and Master Response #10, Translation of the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
187.001	Mr.	Jason	Hotchkiss		5/3/2014	The entire Draft EIS needs to be peer reviewed. Without peer-reviewed process study is a waste of tax payer dollars.	The Draft EIS was reviewed by representatives from all Cooperating Agencies prior to publication and release to the public. To clarify, the NEPA process was funded by the project applicants in a third-party arrangement with OSMRE and was not funded by taxpayer dollars.
188.001	Ms.	Deborah	Abbott		5/5/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comments.
189.001	Ms.	Ricki	Colomb		5/5/2014	Our jobs, our homes, our families need the jobs and economical boost that the plant provides.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
190.001	Ms	Rebecca	Grimes		5/5/2014	I believe closing the power plant and the mine would be devastating to the economy in this area.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
191.001	Ms.	Irene J.	Begay		5/5/2014	1.) Can your company put a fence on east side of road to Burnham. East of new road, so there's no access to property on east of it. We have cattle on that whole side of the old existing fence. We don't want any public trespassing.	This is outside the scope of this NEPA analysis.
191.002	Ms.	Irene J.	Begay		5/5/2014	2.) Please pave the new road. It was nice for a while, now it is washboardy. We have relatives that live out there and its too rough to drive on. Please have the company to maintain the pavement.	As described on page 3-14, Burnham Road would be designed by a New Mexico-registered professional engineer to meet the NNDOT and NMDOT standards as well as SMCRA performance standards of 30 CFR Subchapter K and the Mine Safety and Health Administration standards and requirements for roads. NTEC would be responsible for the maintenance of the road for the duration of the permit term.
191.003	Ms.	Irene J.	Begay		5/5/2014	3.) Continue to work on keeping our air clean. I am don't like to see that smoggy over San Juan Basin.	Thank you for your comment. Air quality is addressed in Section 4.1 of the Draft EIS.
192.001	Ms.	Eileen T.	Lujan		5/5/2014	We approved the main road is re-routed. We asked if it could be paved and the mine Co. maintaining it, And the easement is fenced on the east side of the easement going south. So there will be trespasser.	As described on page 3-14, Burnham Road would be designed by a New Mexico-registered professional engineer to meet the NNDOT and NMDOT standards as well as SMCRA performance standards of 30 CFR Subchapter K and the Mine Safety and Health Administration standards and requirements for roads. NTEC would be responsible for the maintenance of the road for the duration of the permit term. Fencing is not part of these requirements.
192.002	Ms.	Eileen T.	Lujan		5/5/2014	The clean air act should really be enforced	Thank you for your comment. Air quality, including a discussion of the Clean Air Act, is provided in Section 4.1 of the Draft EIS.
193.001	Mr.	Dennis	Vaughn		5/5/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
194.001	Mr.	Dennis	Vaughn		5/5/2014	Real people, real jobs, real lives negatively affected if this project is not approved.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
195.001	Mr.	Carl	Woolfolk	APS-FCPP	5/5/2014	This project is very important to the socioeconomic future of the Navajo Nation and citizens of San Juan County.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
196.001	Mr.	Joshua	Voss	BHP	5/5/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
197.001	Mr.	James R.	Griffin		5/5/2014	I have personally seen the many economic benefits of the APS/BHPB cooperation – good paying jobs and a huge ripple of community benefits resulting from the power generation process.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
198.001					5/5/2014	Please do not translate the EIS into Navajo. This translation is truly not required.	Please see Master Response #10, Translation of the EIS
199.001	Mr.	William J.	Rogers		5/5/2014	I support proposals A, B, C, D, that support improving the economy of the area through increased tax base for the county, state, fed, and tribal.	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.
200.001	Ms	Pamela J.	Norris		5/5/2014	The operation of these plants/mine contribute significantly to the economy of the four corners community; Farmington, Kirtland, Fruitland, Shiprock and other outlying areas. A	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
201.001	Mr.	Michael	Colomb	Mortgage solutions.	5/5/2014	I would like to know the actual goals of each party involved – why are other alternatives being considered? – Goals and end results I feel should be easily understandable – clear and concise – Economic growth coupled with improved living condition as well as environmental benefits/losses.	Section 1 of the Draft EIS summarizes the roles and responsibilities of each of the agencies involved in this project, as well as the project proposals from each proponent and the purpose and need for the proposed action. With regard to alternatives, CEQ regulations require consideration of a wide range of alternatives, including the No action alternative, as part of the NEPA process.
201.002	Mr.	Michael	Colomb	Mortgage solutions.	5/5/2014	The mine must remain open to create jobs – the plant must remain open to create jobs as well as reduce cost of energy production.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
201.003	Mr.	Michael	Colomb	Mortgage solutions.	5/5/2014	If the impact to the environment is less than 1%, then why aren't we researching more efficient methods of existing resources? What actual significant impact does the plant and mine truly have when the public could be at fault?	There are several entities, including universities, industry research groups, and government energy labs that are researching efficient methods of using existing resources. The impacts of continued mine and power plant operations are evaluated in the EIS.
201.004	Mr.	Michael	Colomb	Mortgage solutions.	5/5/2014	Is over grazing or over fishing being considered?	Evaluation of potential impacts of over-grazing and over-fishing is outside the scope of this EIS. Cumulative impacts of the proposed project in consideration of other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects are evaluated in Section 4.18 of the Draft EIS.
201.005	Mr.	Michael	Colomb	Mortgage solutions.	5/5/2014	The plant and mine provide much needed in as for the surrounding areas and cannot be shut down the impact would cripple the local economy which may never recover.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
202.001	Ms	Linda	Yellowman		5/6/2014	I want jobs available for our Dine, so their children can continue to further their educations, have insurances. What will they fall back if the mine was to shut down.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
203.001	Mr.	Wayde	Clark		5/6/2014	In the last ten years, my family has been affected by cancer. Five members have been diagnosed with cancer. We do not have a family history of this disease, it all started ten years ago. We lost one family member, one with stage 4 cancer and three in remission. For this reason I support "Alternative E." I don't want other families to go through what my family went/is going through.	With regard to public health, Section 4.17, pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 provide a summary of the human health risk assessment conducted for the project.
203.002	Mr.	Wayde	Clark		5/6/2014	I know the economic impact of this decision but it is best for all the families in the local area.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
204.001		S.	Clark		5/6/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
205.001	Mr.	Jeffrey B.	Sagor		5/6/2014	I'd like to see a comparison on greenhouse gas emissions to energy efficiency. I was told that this power plant will emit 0.6 percent of greenhouse gas emissions for the U.S. power grid. Is the power plant contributing more, less or equal to that amount of power to the U.S. energy grid.	The Climate Change section of the Cumulative Effects Section of the EIS (4.18.3.2) addresses this comment. The cumulative effects study area for climate change includes northeastern Arizona, southwestern Colorado, Navajo Nation, and northwestern New Mexico. The major producers of GHG emissions within this study area are the 17 power plants, as such, the amount of power produced directly relates to the amount of GHG emitted. Table 4.18-4 shows the relative contribution of future FCPP emissions to regional GHG emissions.
206.001	Mr.	Benny Lee	Jim		5/6/2014	1.) EIS books too lengthy – should be extended (date) for final approval to put use!	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
206.002	Mr.	Benny Lee	Jim		5/6/2014	2.) Plant operations?? Is it now only five days/wk, or it being continued as previous? # of Navajo employees now?	As described in Section 2.2.5 of the Draft EIS, the power plant operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week; however average capacity factor of all units has been approximately 86 percent. Under the proposed action, the power plant would continue the same operating schedule. Workforce at FCPP is described in Section 2.2.2 of the Draft EIS. The FCPP currently employs 474 individuals.
206.003	Mr.	Benny Lee	Jim		5/6/2014	3.) Equipment Breakdowns? Are all the equipment (draglines) aged or new equipment were purchased before Navajo Tribe took over?	Transfer of the mine permit from BNCC to NTEC was considered as part of a separate NEPA process and is addressed as part of the baseline existing conditions in the EIS. Due diligence conducted by either party prior to the transfer is part of a business transaction; therefore, such documentation and records are not part of the proposed project evaluated in this Draft EIS.
207.001	Mr.	Vincent H.	Yazzie		5/6/2014	FC_Draft EISVol1.pdf page 95/960 Figure 2-1. Historic ash placement area symbol needs to be added below "doby". There is a historic ash near the stream below Doby. UTM coordinates is 12 5727424 mE 4059122 mN WGS84. Draft Doby symbol place to high to make it look like there no ash near water source stream.	The location of the historic CCR placement area is accurate on Figure 2 1.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
208.001					5/7/2014	<p>Does EPA know that they are doing?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The money that the mine and four corners gives back to the people in the area</li> <li>• I just now bought a home, thinking that I would be able to retire from four corners</li> <li>• Does EPA know the impact it will have on my family not just my family but the families that do business with the mine and four corners</li> </ul>	For clarification, the Record of Decision for this EIS will be published by OSMRE, not EPA. EPA is participating in this NEPA process as a cooperating agency. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
209.001		Drew		APS	5/7/2014	EPA should have an answer to find alternative income for hundreds of thousands of people that will be affected if the name shuts down.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, the lead agency of this NEPA process is OSMRE, not EPA. EPA is participating as a cooperating agency. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.
209.002		Drew		APS	5/7/2014	I think they should only be concerned with disposal of ash	Disposal of coal combustion residue is addressed in Section 4.5, Water Resources, and Section 4.15 Hazardous Materials and Wastes of the Draft EIS.
210.001	Mr.	Vincent H.	Yazzie		5/7/2014	The environmental assessment says the legal documents to dump ash at the Navajo mine is available at the Navajo mine for review. Need prompt attention to view and copy the legal documents for storing historical ash at the Navajo Mine.	Specific requests for background material used in the development of the Draft EIS should be submitted directly to OSMRE, who will take prompt action with regard to the request.
211.001	Mr.	Barry W.	Dixon		5/7/2014	Failure to approve the EIS will have a devastating impact on the Navajo Nation as a whole for years to come loss of jobs, loss of pride to pay ones way, loss on a middle class livelihood. Not only will the Navajo nation be impacted but hundreds if not thousands of Navajos will be financially impacted. I have reviewed this information presented at the public meetings.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
212.001		Rashaan	Sorrelhorse		5/7/2014	The continuation of the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine will only benefit the Navajo Nation and the employees within the local area. The Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine play an important role in the Four Corners Region.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
213.001	Ms.	Tamia	Melendez		5/7/2014	The “proposed action” is beneficial not only to my family and I, but the thousands of workers and their families that are tied into this project. To me, personally, this plan affects me tremendously. If the “proposed action” plan was not approved then my mother would be out of work.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
214.001	Mr.	Nathan	Tohtsoni		5/7/2014	The Plant and mine are virtual partners in the community.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
215.001	Mr.	Jatee	Thomas		5/7/2014	I believe there is still going to be the same amount of air, ground, surface, water and environmental pollution as before, but more concern within each organization and cooperation then in the past decades.	Thank you for your comment. An evaluation of potential impacts to air quality, earth resources, and water resources is provided in Sections 4.1, 4.3, and 4.5 of the Draft EIS, respectively.
215.002	Ms.	Jatee	Thomas		5/7/2014	I believe there are also going to be the same amounts of jobs also because the power plant is not adding stacks, but reduced stacks. They're not adding jobs because area IV is pretty much the same in land area as area III.	Changes in workforce as part of the proposed project are described in Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft EIS. A complete discussion of socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
215.003	Ms.	Jatee	Thomas		5/7/2014	New technology is the way of the future, to learn ways to better address energy, environment and society. This is what the self-determination is all about.	Thank you for your comment.
216.001	Mr.	Franklin	Charty		5/7/2014	It is important for the community and especially the Navajo tribe and San Juan County getting revenues from these companies.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
217.001	Mr.	Anthony	Peterman		5/8/2014	The Navajo Mine and APS power plant and the tremendous resource to the Navajo nation and our people. It is difficult to consider what we would do without the income and jobs supplied by these resources.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
217.002	Mr.	Anthony	Peterman		5/8/2014	We understand that a transition needs to be made to cleaner sources of energy over time, we need this transition to develop other source of revenue and clean energy technologies. This transition must happen in balanced manner and the approval of this EIS will help facilitate that.	Thank you for your comment. For clarification, the EIS evaluates potential impacts of OSMRE's decision to approve or disapprove the SMCRA permit for the Pinabete Permit Area and permit renewal for the Navajo Mine Permit Area; BIA's decision to approve or disapprove the Lease Amendment #3 for the FCPP; and BIA and BLM's decisions to approve or disapprove the rights-of-way renewals for segments of the subject transmission lines. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.
218.001	Mr.	Vincent H.	Yazzie		5/8/2014	<p>Please look at the aquifer data again. In volume 1, or file FC_draft EIS Vol1.pdf page 416 of 960 Table 4.5-4 Groundwater Aquifer Properties in the San Juan Basin "Picture Cliffs Sandstone, 0.12 to 0.79 square foot per day 0.032 foot per day to 0.0001 foot per day. "0.12 square foot per day" coverts to 0.9 gal/day/ft</p> <p>0.9 gal/day/ft is found in environmental assessment.</p> <p>Specifically found in Ch6GroundwaterHydrology.pdf page 15 of 70 Figure 6-3 (Pictured Cliffs Sandstone) 6-9. <math>T=264/80(0.3) = 0.9</math> gal/day/ft/</p> <p>I calculate <math>T = 0.7224</math> gal/day/ft using <math>s = 33</math> ft <math>\log 2 - 0.301</math> Hydraulic transmissivity is off. Groundwater aquifer properties in the San Juan Basin needs to be recalculated.</p>	Thank you for your comment and the information provided. The permit application provides a characterization of the groundwater environment, and specifically groundwater quantity at Chapter 6, Section 6.2 (now Section 18.2.5.1 in the e-permit). To characterize the transmissivity of the Picture Cliffs Sandstone, an aquifer recovery test was performed, and graphical analysis was completed using the McWhorter method (1980). Graphical analysis is at Chapter 6, Section 6.2, Figure 6-3 (now Section 18.2.5.1, Figure 18-4 in the e-permit). Application of graphical analysis requires some interpretation to identify where the slope line intercepts the x-axis. For this analysis, the x-axis intercept point could be interpreted as a value of 1.0 or 1.1. A value of 1.0 was used in the permit, resulting in a transmissivity of 0.12 square foot per day. Using a value of 1.1 would result in a transmissivity of 0.13 square foot per day. The Draft EIS at Table 4.5 4, characterizes the transmissivity to have a variable range between 0.12 to 0.79 square foot per day. Interpretation of an x-axis intercept of 1.1 would still result in a transmissivity within the range provided at Table 4.5-4, and not affect the impact analysis or the conclusion presented in the Draft EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
219.001	Ms.	Donna	House		5/9/2014	Extend Comment period. The open House approach is not appropriate for communities. There should be a public hearing at each Navajo Agency since this impacts all Dine people's health and entertainment and cultural ways.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period and Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format
220.001	Mr.	Vincent H.	Yazzie		5/9/2014	I was not able to get the \$1/ton for which the coal is sold at. \$1/ton is used to determine how much the Navajo nation is getting and if it's a fair price for which coal is sold at for the appropriate coal rank.	Page 4.12-5 of the Draft EIS states that the assumed price per ton of coal mined by permit area at the Navajo Mine is \$34.22 per ton.
220.002	Mr.	Vincent H.	Yazzie		5/9/2014	There needs to be a 60 day extension for me to comment more.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period
221.001	Ms.	Annie	Walker		5/9/2014	The Draft EIS, Volumes I and II Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine Energy Project is 1500 pages written in ultra technical language that can be understood by the people who wrote the two volumes. As such, EIS Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine energy project falls in a discriminatory practice in areas where most of the public speak English as a second language. I have a suggestion. Redo the entire public hearing in layman language to get greater public participation. Is so senseless to present EIS in an ultra technical language.	Please see Master Response #10, Translation of the EIS
222.001	Ms.	Annie	Walker		5/7/2014	On May 7, 2014 between 4:25 and 4:35 pm (about) I experienced acute respiratory syndrome that left me unable to breath until I was able to get away from direct downwind of emission smoke from the power plant stack.	The analysis in the EIS addressed health effects from the stack and found them to be minor.
223.001	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley	Dine C.A.R.E	5/30/2014	This EIS process was intimidating and inadequate as there were 20+ OSM staff and third-party consultants, mostly English-speaking individuals standing next to 20+ poster boards.	Please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format
223.002	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley	Dine C.A.R.E	5/30/2014	This format was confusing... these meetings.	Please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format
223.003	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley	Dine C.A.R.E	5/30/2014	One main thing I noticed was that it is out of the way on the outskirts of Shiprock.	Please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format
223.004	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley	Dine C.A.R.E	5/30/2014	Another thing I noticed was there was no sign anywhere, outside or around the building or by the highway, alerting the public there was a community event going on inside.	Please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format
223.005	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley	Dine C.A.R.E	5/30/2014	I also asked why there was no public speaking available?	Please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format
223.006	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley	Dine C.A.R.E	5/30/2014	I also asked him why they had not booked the Shiprock Chapter for the event.	Please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format
223.007	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley	Dine C.A.R.E	5/30/2014	I also stated, why there were not more area events and why this EIS and information wasn't put into Navajo, considering the Navajo people are the most affected.	Please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format and Master Response #10, Translation of the EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
223.008	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley	Dine C.A.R.E	5/30/2014	I respectfully request a second go around, with these community meetings and to include oral comments.	Please see Master Response #6, Recirculation of the EIS
223.009	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley	Dine C.A.R.E	5/30/2014	I knew there were already 2 errors in the EA, so I found one EA value corresponding to one in the EIS mainly the hydrologic transmissivity of the Picture Cliff Sandstone. The line slope is off. OSM said they would fix it.	Thank you for your comment and the information provided. The permit application provides a characterization of the groundwater environment, and specifically groundwater quantity at Chapter 6, Section 6.2 (now Section 18.2.5.1 in the e-permit). To characterize the transmissivity of the Picture Cliffs Sandstone, an aquifer recovery test was performed, and graphical analysis was completed using the McWhorter method (1980). Graphical analysis is at Chapter 6, Section 6.2, Figure 6-3 (now Section 18.2.5.1, Figure 18-4 in the e-permit). Application of graphical analysis requires some interpretation to identify where the slope line intercepts the x-axis. For this analysis, the x-axis intercept point could be interpreted as a value of 1.0 or 1.1. A value of 1.0 was used in the permit, resulting in a transmissivity of 0.12 square foot per day. Using a value of 1.1 would result in a transmissivity of 0.13 square foot per day. The Draft EIS at Table 4.5 4, characterizes the transmissivity to have a variable range between 0.12 to 0.79 square foot per day. Interpretation of an x-axis intercept of 1.1 would still result in a transmissivity within the range provided at Table 4.5-4, and not affect the impact analysis or the conclusion presented in the Draft EIS.
223.010	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley	Dine C.A.R.E	5/30/2014	I suggested that OSM include health studies, but they did not even consider including health study in the EIS.	Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS addresses health and safety; specifically, pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarize the results of the human health risk assessment conducted for the project. In addition, public health is addressed in the air quality analysis (Section 4.2), as well as project-specific analyses of health effects of diesel particulate matter and fugitive dust. The EIS also summarizes local health studies conducted by New Mexico Environment Department.
223.011	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley	Dine C.A.R.E	5/30/2014	Relocation of residents has already happened in Area III and IV and now it will happen in Area IV south and Area V.	Relocation of three residences within the Pinabete SMCRA Permit area is discussed in Section 4.9, Land Use and Transportation, of the Draft EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
223.012	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley	Dine C.A.R.E	5/30/2014	I asked about coal ash impoundments and an OSM staff said the ash is not toxic and the ash ponds are lined. He didn't know if the ash was Type I or Type II. He said the ash ponds are lined and it will take 200 years to get into the San Juan River.	EPA published its Final Rule for Hazardous and Solid Waste Management System; Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals from Electrical Utilities on December 19, 2014. Under the Final Rule, EPA has determined that CCR will be regulated under Subtitle D (non-hazardous) as a solid waste. The regulation is self-implementing and applies to the disposal of CCR generated from coal-fired generating stations, including tribal lands. The rule includes provisions for dust control and groundwater monitoring. The regulation does not extend to placement of CCR in mines. The Final EIS has been updated accordingly to reflect the Final Rule and its applicability to CCR disposal at the FCPP. A comprehensive discussion of the rule, its provisions, and enforceability is provided in Section 4.15, Hazardous Materials and Wastes. In addition, specific provisions of the rule that apply to other resource areas (i.e., water and air) are included in Sections 4.1, 4.5, 4.11, 4.17, and 4.18.
223.013	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley	Dine C.A.R.E	5/30/2014	I asked about the burial sites and sacred sites in the mining area and an OSM consultant said the study was done by experts (archaeologists) and the studies are confidential and the families were all notified and gave consent for these studies to be done.	This is a correct statement. A discussion of potential impacts to cultural resources is provided in Section 4.4 of the Draft EIS.
223.014	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley	Dine C.A.R.E	5/30/2014	I started looking at the poster boards presented by OSM staff and I noticed there was no poster boards or information on the agricultural impacts	Given the space available in the meeting rooms, OSMRE worked with cooperating agencies and evaluated comments received during the scoping period to prepare the public meeting materials, which addressed the major issues of public controversy and interest related to the project. A poster was not prepared for every resource area; however, OSMRE staff was available to answer questions on every resource area analysis.
223.015	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley	Dine C.A.R.E	5/30/2014	Who manages and maintains the existing Burnham road? I asked this question to BIA rep., Lyle Ben and he said, the company (referring to BHP) is responsible.	As the ROW holder, BHP (now NTEC/MMCo) is responsible for maintaining Burnham Road and would continue to be responsible if BIA grants the request to realign Burnham Road to accommodate mining activities in the Pinabete SMCRA Permit Area. A portion of the existing Burnham Road in Areas IV North and South would be removed and a new segment would be engineered, constructed, and maintained in accordance with federal standards (see Section 3.2.1.1, Figure 3-1).
223.016	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley	Dine C.A.R.E	5/30/2014	I asked the water quality representative – how many more gallons of water will be used from the San Juan River in order for the power plant and mine to continue running for an additional 25 years?	Water supply for the mine and power plant is described in Section 4.5 of the Draft EIS. As described on page 4.5-32, BBNMC holds New Mexico Office of the State Engineer Permit Number 2838 and associated groundwater Permit Number SJ-2917, which provides NTEC a total diversionary right of 51,600 acre-feet annually, with a consumptive right of 39,000 acre-feet annually, for waters drawn from the San Juan River.
223.017	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley	Dine C.A.R.E	5/30/2014	I asked Marcelo about the number of tons of coal ash that was stored at Navajo Mine between 1971-2008	Per the CHIA for the Navajo Mine, a combined total of approximately 4 million tons per year was placed in mined out pits at the San Juan and Navajo Mines between 1971 and 2008.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
223.018	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley	Dine C.A.R.E	5/30/2014	There was no Navajo interpreter and no representation from EPA present at this meeting	Navajo interpreters were present at all public meetings held on tribal trust lands. OSMRE requested the attendance of the cooperating agencies at all public meetings; however decisions to attend were at the discretion of each individual agency. Representatives from BIA, USACE, and the Navajo Nation were present at most meetings.
224.001	Mr.	Michael	Murray		5/29/2014	I agree with Alternative A. I work at 4 Corners Plant. Want to see plant stay open. Its good for economy of whole 4 Corners Area.	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.
225.001	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Executive Summary Page i - Is there an updated certified appraisal for the four primary and related actions?	Per 25 CFR 169, a certified appraisal is required to ensure that tribal landowners receive fair-market value for a realty transaction (e.g., ROW, lease). However, this requirement can be waived by the Secretary of Interior at the request of a Tribe. The Navajo Nation has submitted such a request but has not received a response from the Department of Interior yet. In the event that the Department of Interior denies the Navajo Nation's request for a waiver, a certified appraisal will be required to fulfill this regulatory requirement. The Secretary of Interior will make a decision on the waiver prior to the issuance of the Record of Decision.
225.002	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Executive Summary Page i -Primary Action No. 1 should not be approved by the Secretary of the Interior because there is no data presented or cited in the Draft EIS of methods and timeframes for controlling (sub)urban sprawl in Arizona, New Mexico, Texas and California.	Control of suburban or urban sprawl in Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and California is outside the scope of this project. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.
225.003	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Executive Summary Page i - Why were two federal actions taken prior to the approval of the EIS?	The Federal Implementation Plan for the FCPP approved by the EPA in 2012 is an agency action exempt from NEPA. Regarding the transfer of the SMCRA permit from BNCC to NTEC, please see Master Response #7, Mine Permit Transfer.
225.004	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Executive Summary Page i - Were amendments to NTC Lease 14-20-603-2505, increasing the leased acres from 24,000 to 33,600, based on certified appraisal updates?	Per 25 CFR 169, a certified appraisal is required to ensure that tribal landowners receive fair-market value for a realty transaction (e.g., ROW, lease). However, this requirement can be waived by the Secretary of Interior at the request of a Tribe. The Navajo Nation has submitted such a request but has not received a response from the Department of Interior yet. In the event that the Department of Interior denies the Navajo Nation's request for a waiver, a certified appraisal will be required to fulfill this regulatory requirement. The Secretary of Interior will make a decision on the waiver prior to the issuance of the Record of Decision.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
225.005	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Executive Summary Page i - Approval of Proposed Action No. 3 should be contingent upon the proposed EIS providing data on the historic and future effects of such line/related facilities on humans residing within one square mile of each line/related facilities.	Approval or disapproval of the Lease Amendment is based on the evaluation of impacts described within the Draft EIS. The region of influence evaluated for potential impacts associated with operation of the FCPP varies by resource area. For example the region of influence for cultural resources is the lease area boundary, whereas the region of influence for air quality is a 50 km radius from the power plant.
225.006	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Executive Summary Page i - Approval of Proposed Action No. 4 must provide additional language that states the number of actual Indian homes in Arizona and New Mexico projected to be provided electricity, and how/when this will be accomplished. Such rural housing must benefit from the FCPP and treated on equal footing with suburbia.	In accordance with federal trust policy, the Secretary of the Interior, as the trustee, has a responsibility to ensure that the ventures involving tribal trust assets do not create a liability for the federal government and result in a benefit to the Tribe. However, the Tribe maintains discretion on how to utilize trust resources as a course of tribal self-determination.
225.007	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Executive Summary Page i - Table ES-2 should state that BIA approval of access road realignments and ROW renewals is contingent upon a current certified appraisal.	Per 25 CFR 169, a certified appraisal is required to ensure that tribal landowners receive fair-market value for a realty transaction (e.g., ROW, lease). However, this requirement can be waived by the Secretary of Interior at the request of a Tribe. The Navajo Nation has submitted such a request but has not received a response from the Department of Interior yet. In the event that the Department of Interior denies the Navajo Nation's request for a waiver, a certified appraisal will be required to fulfill this regulatory requirement. The Secretary of Interior will make a decision on the waiver prior to the issuance of the Record of Decision.
225.008	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page vi - Table ES-2 should state that BLM must not approve the Pinabete Mine Plan, however, if it chooses-to do so must-adhere-to the contingencies identified in this herein comment document. It should also state that BLM approval of ROW renewals must be contingent upon current certified appraisals, and federally approved economic coal recovery plan.	BLM has no authority over the Pinabete Mine Plan. OSMRE has the decision to approve or disapprove the SMCRA permit for the Pinabete Permit Area and the permit renewal for the Navajo Mine Permit Area. Please see Master Response #11, Placement of Conditions on Permit and Lease Approval. BLM is not required to produce a certified appraisal to issue a decision. Additionally, BLM will consult with OSMRE to identify and evaluate potential impacts to cultural resources under NHPA Section 106.  Per 25 CFR 169, a certified appraisal is required to ensure that tribal landowners receive fair-market value for a realty transaction (e.g., ROW, lease). However, this requirement can be waived by the Secretary of Interior at the request of a Tribe. The Navajo Nation has submitted such a request but has not received a response from the Department of Interior yet. In the event that the Department of Interior denies the Navajo Nation's request for a waiver, a certified appraisal will be required to fulfill this regulatory requirement. The Secretary of Interior will make a decision on the waiver prior to the issuance of the Record of Decision.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
225.009	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page vi - Table ES-2 should state that USACE approval of the CWA permit must be contingent upon a current certified appraisal and provide historic and future effects of such permit to affected water resources and quantities affected. The CWA permit must include provisions of how the approved permit will be enforced. Does USACE specify quantities of water used for coal-cleaning techniques?	The USACE CWA permit will address the discharge of fill into jurisdictional waters of the U.S., as described in Section 4.5. The 404 permit will include mitigation measures for the permitted impacts, as well as a permit duration. Water supply for the mine and power plant is described in Section 4.5 of the Draft EIS. As described on page 4.5-32, BBNMC holds New Mexico Office of the State Engineer Permit Number 2838 and associated groundwater Permit Number SJ-2917, which provides NTEC a total diversionary right of 51,600 acre-feet annually, with a consumptive right of 39,000 acre-feet annually, for waters drawn from the San Juan River.
225.010	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page vi - Table ES-2 should state that NPDES permit application must include the following: certified approved appraisal; methods and timeframes for controlling (sub)urban sprawl in KL, NM, TX, and CA; and state that permit is subject to reviews at five-year intervals.	Requirements of the NPDES permit application are provided in the Clean Water Act language and application forms developed by the EPA. Potential impacts with regard to population growth and public services are addressed in Section 4.10 of the EIS.  Per 25 CFR 169, a certified appraisal is required to ensure that tribal landowners receive fair-market value for a realty transaction (e.g., ROW, lease). However, this requirement can be waived by the Secretary of Interior at the request of a Tribe. The Navajo Nation has submitted such a request but has not received a response from the Department of Interior yet. In the event that the Department of Interior denies the Navajo Nation's request for a waiver, a certified appraisal will be required to fulfill this regulatory requirement. The Secretary of Interior will make a decision on the waiver prior to the issuance of the Record of Decision.  Urban sprawl is outside of the scope of the EIS.
225.011	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page vii - The No Action Alternative is the best alternative. If Units 1-3 can be shut down, Units 4-5 can also be permanently shut down. The proposed EIS must develop the No Action Alternative as detailed as the Proposed Action. For the No Action Alternative, a detailed Decommission and Reclamation Plan for the power plant, electrical transmission lines and related facilities, must be required and implemented between the years 2015-2041.	OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015. As described in Section 3.2.5.2, the Plant would discontinue operation and the site would be decommissioned in accordance with the requirements of the 1960 and 1966 leases and existing 323 ROW grants for the plant site. With regard to the transmission lines, as described in Section 3.2.5.3, the lines would either be decommissioned and dismantled or left in place to transmit power from another power source in the region. As with the FCPP, decommissioning and dismantling activities would need to be coordinated with the Navajo Nation, Hopi Tribe, and the BLM so that the area meets the specific needs of the planned reuse. Compliance with all environmental laws and regulations would occur throughout the demolition process. The timeline for this process is not mandated in regulatory statutes and is unknown at this time.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
225.012	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page vii - There is no evidence or critical studies cited for decisions reached in Table ES-3. Other than SCR devices, it appears that no Clean Coal Technologies (CCTs) are cited concerning advanced coal utilization processes which may be commercially viable in the 21 <sup>st</sup> century that are cleaner, more efficient, and less costly than conventional coal-using processes depicted in the Draft EIS. A wide variety of CCTs exist, all of them altering the basic structure of coal before, during, or after combustion in such a way as to reduce emission of impurities such as sulfur and nitrogen oxide, and increase the efficiency of production. Table ES-3 lacks research based decisions on any CCT demonstration programs (joint efforts of the federal government and private industry funded by Congress) to foster development of the most promising CCTs such as improved methods of cleaning coal, fluidized bed combustion (q.v.) integrated gasification combined cycle, furnace sorbent injection, advanced flue gas desulfurization, etc.	The evaluation of impacts followed methods generally accepted by the scientific community as per CEQ guidelines. Specific methods used are described within each resource area discussion in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS.  With regard to clean coal technologies, Section 3.3.2, discusses an alternatives for a solar thermal/coal hybrid option. In addition, as described in Section 2.2.3, Units 4 and 5 are equipped currently with a flue gas desulfurization system.
225.013	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page ii - Was a certified appraisal done for the proposed new 5,600-acre permit area known as the Pinabete Permit Area?	Per 25 CFR 169, a certified appraisal is required to ensure that tribal landowners receive fair-market value for a realty transaction (e.g., ROW, lease). However, this requirement can be waived by the Secretary of Interior at the request of a Tribe. The Navajo Nation has submitted such a request but has not received a response from the Department of Interior yet. In the event that the Department of Interior denies the Navajo Nation's request for a waiver, a certified appraisal will be required to fulfill this regulatory requirement. The Secretary of Interior will make a decision on the waiver prior to the issuance of the Record of Decision.
225.014	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page ii - Cite OSMRE's legal authority for the proposed "administrative" approval to extend Federal Permit NM003F. An approved EIS should be required for this federal action prior to conducting any mining operations.	An EIS is not required for administrative approval to extend the permit. In this case, the extension is only sufficient to complete the EIS and the Record of Determination.
225.015	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page ii - Was the 1960 lease and 1966 amendment thereto based on an approved certified appraisal? Lease Amendment No. 3 should be subject to five-year ladder reviews during the proposed 25-year leased period and updated certified appraisal (every five years) of the FCPP facilities area and ancillary facilities (i.e., transmission lines, water pipelines, access roads) on Navajo trust lands.	Per 25 CFR 169, a certified appraisal is required to ensure that tribal landowners receive fair-market value for a realty transaction (e.g., ROW, lease). However, this requirement can be waived by the Secretary of Interior at the request of a Tribe. The Navajo Nation has submitted such a request but has not received a response from the Department of Interior yet. In the event that the Department of Interior denies the Navajo Nation's request for a waiver, a certified appraisal will be required to fulfill this regulatory requirement. The Secretary of Interior will make a decision on the waiver prior to the issuance of the Record of Decision.  Please see Master Response #12, Placement of Conditions on Permit and Lease Approval.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
225.016	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page ii -Concerning proposed Amendment No. 3 to the 1960 lease, it is the Secretary of the Interior's trust responsibility to require that Navajo Nation tribal regulation apply to the FCPP and ancillary facilities lease/ROW areas located on Navajo trust lands, albeit the Navajo Nation may have approved the Amendment without such requirement.	Please see Master Response #11, Covenant 17
225.017	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page iii - Is there a federally-approved Decommission and Reclamation Plan for units 1, 2, and 3 apparently shut down on December 30, 2013, and what role will Southern California Edison have in executing any such plan?	There is no federally-approved Decommission and Reclamation Plan for Units 1, 2, and 3. They are currently left in place. Upon decommissioning, as described in Section 3.2.5.2, the Plant would discontinue operation and the site would be decommissioned in accordance with the requirements of the 1960 and 1966 leases and existing 323 ROW grants for the plant site. Southern California Edison no longer owns any portion of the FCPP and will have no role in executing any decommissioning plan. It is business confidential information whether SCE retained any financial liability associated with decommissioning.
225.018	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page iii - What is Southern California Edison's role in combating greenhouse gases caused by irreversible atmospheric and ecological damages from past operations of units 1, 2, and 3; i.e., that identified in Table ES-1 "Historic Baseline Emissions" column for units 1-3? From 1957 to 1970 (when the Clean Air Act was enacted), Units 1-3 greenhouse gases were uncontrolled resulting in 13 years of acid rain and other ecological damages.	As described in Section 2.4.2.1, Southern California Edison (SCE) currently owns 48 percent of the capacity of Units 4 and 5. It never owned capacity from Units 1 through 3. In September 2006, California enacted Senate Bill (SB) 1368, which requires power plants to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases. SB 1368 prohibits long-term investments in baseload generation by California investor-owned utilities that fail to meet a carbon dioxide (CO2) Energy Performance Standard jointly established by the California Energy Commission and the California Public Utilities Commission. This Energy Performance Standard is 1,100 pounds of CO2 per MW-hour (California Public Utilities Commission Decision No. 07-01-039). The law prohibits SCE from making new long-term ownership investments in any baseload plant that does not meet this Energy Performance Standard, including FCPP.  SCE, therefore, plans to terminate its participation in FCPP, and has reached an agreement with APS to sell its ownership shares of Units 4 and 5. The California Public Utilities Commission approved this agreement in 2011 (Decision No 07-09-040), and the Arizona Corporation Commission authorized APS to purchase SCE's interests in Units 4 and 5.  Because SCE never owned portions of Units 1-3, they do not have any financial liability associated with them.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
225.019	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page iii - What sanctions/penalties are in place for the lack of SCR equipment to units 4 and 5 between 1957 to July 31, 2018? The EIS must state how federal agencies will monitor and enforce the July 31, 2018 deadline, and how it will disallow further APS/operators from requesting further extensions beyond the deadline.	There is no sanction or penalty in place for the lack of SCR equipment prior to its required installation date of 2018. The FCPP has operated in accordance with Federal Regulations, and the requirement for SCR is new with the FIP for BART issued by EPA in 2012. The duty to monitor and enforce the installation of SCR by July 31, 2018 is the responsibility of EPA. Likewise, EPA has the ability to accommodate requested extensions from FCPP. These actions are under the purview of the Federal Implementation Plan for the FCPP which is considered part of the baseline setting for this NEPA analysis.
225.020	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page iii - Table ES-1 must specify "Historic" and "Future" in actual years. Also segregate historic baseline emissions based on historic ownership share of the units in two separate columns, i.e., Units 1-3 and Units 4-5.	Definition of baseline and future periods was defined in the Table notes in the Draft EIS. Ownership of units is defined on page ii of the Executive Summary. No change made.
225.021	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page iii - Summarize how the emission rates in Table ES-1 compare to comparable U.S. facilities.	Table 4.18-2 and 4.18-3 of the Draft EIS provide this information.
225.022	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page iv - Does the "environmental baseline" in Table ES-1 factor in the effects of approving the proposed Pinabete Permit?	No, Table ES-1 summarizes emissions from FCPP.
225.023	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page v - Proposed Action No. 3 must clarify that approval is only for existing electric transmission lines and related facilities, and a provision clarifying that approval does not infer construction of new lines/related facilities.	The sentence has been revised to state: "Continue operation and maintenance of existing electric transmission lines and related facilities..."
225.024	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page ix - There is no justification for the proposed future production of 5 .8 million (metric?) tons of bituminous and/or sub bituminous coal annually, absent adequate industrial recovery plans and absent rigorous interagency oversight plans for the industrial recovery plans.	The mining has regulatory oversight by OSMRE under SMCRA, and by the BLM. SMCRA requires reclamation plans, and actively monitors the timely implementation of those plans.
225.025	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page ix - Combine Table ES-4 and Table ES-5 for comparison of acres disturbed and tons of coal mined per five year intervals.	Thank you for your comment. Such a change would not affect any analyses or provide additional information, therefore the suggested edit has not been made.
225.026	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page xii - Define "temporary" in terms of years concerning the number of "temporary drainage and sediment control structures."	The following text has been added to the sentence and the same sentence located on page 3-11 of the Draft EIS: Additionally, the number of temporary drainage and sediment control structures ( <u>present for the duration of active reclamation in a particular reclamation block</u> ) can be reduced by regrading larger portions of the post-mining watersheds.
225.027	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page xii - From where will ammonia be transported, and what projected transportation routes (mapped) will be used? What are the consequences of using liquid v. solid ammonia? Specify the projected quantities of ammonia required per year.	Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS addresses the transport and risk scenarios associated with various forms of ammonia, as well as the projected quantities required per year.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
225.028	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page xii - How much acre-feet of water per year will be used by FCPP for Units 4 and 5?	As stated on page 3-15, the shutdown of Units 1, 2, and 3 reduced annual water consumption by 5,000 to 7,000 acre-feet per year. Average annual water consumption between 2000 and 2011 was 22,856 acre-feet per year for the entire plant (page 2-23). This total would be reduced accordingly.
225.029	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page xix - Reclamation and environmental monitoring activities would continue until 2041, not for a "minimum of 10 years after revegetation." Revegetation is not the only issue.	As stated on page xix, under the No action alternative, reclamation and environmental monitoring activities would continue for a minimum of 10 years after revegetation until OSMRE's approval affirming that all reclamation requirements have been met and OSMRE jurisdiction is terminated (2034 at the earliest).
225.030	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page xix - Decommissioning should not be limited to the 1960 and 1966 lease provisions. The EIS can and should specify that 2014 decommissioning industry benchmarks will be employed and updated in five year intervals until 2041.	Please see Master Response #12, Placement of Conditions on Permit and Lease
225.031	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page xix - Chart out the agencies and authorities for the following statement: "All waste generated during this phase would be managed and disposed of in accordance with applicable federal environmental regulations."	Applicable federal regulations are described in Section 4.15, Hazardous Materials and Wastes.
225.032	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page xix - Structural foundations would be removed to 48" below grade not 24" below grade.	The Draft EIS consistently states that "[u]pon removal of structures and facilities, the structural foundations would be removed to 24 inches below grade, the site would be profiled to allow for proper drainage, and native vegetation would be planted."  This depth was proposed by APS as the adequate depth to allow for sufficient reclamation/restoration.
225.033	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page xix -The options for leaving transmission lines in place or reuse are presumptuous. Such lines must be dismantled.	The decision to leave transmission lines in place under the No Action Alternative is at the discretion of APS and PNM.
225.034	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page xix - While the timeline for the demolition process may not be mandated in regulatory statutes and "unknown" as a result, it is incumbent upon cooperating federal agencies to specify a demolition process timeline of 2015-2041 in the EIS.	The Draft EIS describes the actions that would be required under demolition, based on current agreements and regulatory requirements. The timing is under the control of the FCPP partners.
225.035	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page xix - It is presumptuous to state that "ceasing to utilize the infrastructure [transmission and ancillary facilities] would undermine regional power reliability. It is incumbent upon Regional power companies to develop alternative infrastructure when the FCPP infrastructure is retired permanently, thus can also serve 500,000+ former customers of the FCPP.	The statement is based on the operations of the western utilities transmission line infrastructure, and current demand profiles for the FCPP partner companies service territory.
225.036	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page xxi - It appears that Table ES-11, in total or in part, is not applicable to the No Action Alternative.	The title of Table ES-11 has been amended to state "All Action Alternatives"

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
225.037	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 1-2 - Rather than using coal solely from the Navajo Mine, can coal be imported? If the U. S. is a world leader in producing and exporting coal, can it also import coal to the FCPP?	Section 3.3.5 discusses the alternative for off-site coal supply
225.038	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 1-2 - Why is EPE's share of 7 percent listed when it is to be purchased by APS?	The purchase of EPE's share of FCPP had not occurred prior to the publication of the Draft EIS and is not expected prior to the Record of Decision.
225.039	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 1-3 - Can EPA take the lead to improve its laws comparable to CA Senate Bill 1364 or better for the 50 states?	Federal laws are written and approved by the federal legislature and the President of the U.S. Federal agencies are charged with the implementation of such laws. Development of new laws is outside the scope of this NEPA process.
225.040	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 1-3 - Why would NTEC want to purchase the 7 percent EPE share?	To fulfill the project purpose and need of gaining greater control over the resources on the tribal lands.
225.041	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 1-3 - ROW renewals for four transmission lines traverse Indian trust lands must be based upon current certified appraisals.	Per 25 CFR 169, a certified appraisal is required to ensure that tribal landowners receive fair-market value for a realty transaction (e.g., ROW, lease). However, this requirement can be waived by the Secretary of Interior at the request of a Tribe. The Navajo Nation has submitted such a request but has not received a response from the Department of Interior yet. In the event that the Department of Interior denies the Navajo Nation's request for a waiver, a certified appraisal will be required to fulfill this regulatory requirement. The Secretary of Interior will make a decision on the waiver prior to the issuance of the Record of Decision.
225.042	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 1-4 - Are there a Plat and a certified appraisal for the Navajo Mine lease granted in July 1957?	This information is likely to be a part of the lease package, but was not needed for the NEPA analyses.
225.043	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 1-4 - The EIS must add a discussion on the impacts to NAPI as a result of its proximity to the FCPP and Navajo Mine Energy Project.	Impacts to NAPI lands are addressed in Section 4.9 of the Draft EIS.
225.044	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 1-9 - Customers of the FCPP must be displayed by map in the EIS. In which communities are the primary beneficiaries of the FCPP located? Why are these not displayed in graphics?	As described in Section 1.1.2, The FCPP has historically provided power to more than 500,000 customers in Arizona, New Mexico, California, and Texas. As further described in Section 2.4.2.1, California enacted Senate Bill 1368, which requires power plants to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases. Senate Bill 1368 prohibits long-term investments in baseload generation by California investor-owned utilities that fail to meet a CO2 Energy Performance Standard. Thus, FCPP power will no longer be distributed to California. A map is not necessary to depict the very wide distribution of FCPP power; no change made to Draft EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
225.045	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 1-9 - It is a cliché to state, “Provide for tribal self-determination and promote tribal economic development. . . “ without stating how such will be accomplished. For example, how will the FCPP provide a competitive alternative to Navajo Tribal Utility Authority? How many Indian residences will be provided power by the FCPP? How many Navajo owned businesses and industries on Indian trust lands (reservation and allotments) will be provided power by the FCPP?	By receiving royalties, taxes, and revenues from the lease of tribal trust lands and the sale of trust assets (i.e. coal), the Navajo Nation is exercising its sovereign rights to promote economic development and self-determination. The FCPP and Navajo Mine directly benefit the Navajo Nation by providing approximately 800 jobs for Navajo members and taxes/revenues to the Tribe. Economic benefits, including jobs and direct payments to the Tribe, support the operation of Navajo Nation governmental operations, including NTUA  The FCPP lease, including Amendment #3, does not include any stipulations requiring the sale or transmission of energy to NTUA or Navajo residences. The Navajo Nation could elect to expand energy transmission with the revenues it receives from the Project, but it is outside the scope of the EIS to dictate how the Tribe is governed.
225.046	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 1-9 - Table 1-1 is identical to Table ES-2, so Table 1-1 can be eliminated and references made to Table ES-2.	The Executive Summary is a brief summary of the important components of the Draft EIS, and is meant to be able to read and understood as a stand-alone document. As such, all information in the ES is copied verbatim from sections in the Draft EIS.
225.047	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 1-11 - What type of infrastructure will be developed?	A complete description of infrastructure to be developed as part of the proposed Pinabete Permit Area is provided in Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft EIS.
225.048	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 1-11 - Will a federally-approved reclamation/recovery planned be required?	A federally-approved reclamation and recovery plan is a required component of the SMCRA permit. As stated in Section 1.4.1, OSMRE’s action is to approve or disapprove of the Pinabete Permit Application, which includes reclamation actions for the subject areas.
225.049	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 1-11 - Is the revised Mine Plan to be approved by BLM in the EIS?	The Mine Plan is part of the SMCRA permit application and is available as part of the Administrative Record of the project. This is also under review by BLM for their action.
225.050	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 1-11 - It appears inconsistent for USACE to state that no jurisdictional waters would be impacted yet require Navajo Mine’s permit for an Individual Permit for impacts to jurisdictional waters. Are there jurisdictional waters?	The USACE has verified that no jurisdictional waters would be impacted by the proposed action at FCPP; therefore, APS does not need a CWA 404 permit. The USACE has verified that jurisdictional water would be impacted by the proposed action at Navajo Mine; therefore, NTEC is required to obtain an Individual 404 permit.
225.051	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 1-13 - What alternative energy resources were recommended?	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives
225.052	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 1-13 - What legal definition of “sacred Native American sites” is used?	Section 1.5.2 provides a summary of the scoping comments received from agencies and the public, as such, “sacred Native American sites” is the terminology used by the commenters and repeated in the Draft EIS.
225.053	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-3 - Figure 2-1 is meaningless as currently presented. It should be overlaid to Figure 1-2.	Figure 2-1 displays all significant features of the Navajo Mine lease area and operations. No change has been made.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
225.054	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-5 - Total acres for all resource areas must be displayed in Table 2-1. Resource Areas III, IV N & S, and V must be closed and retired permanently.	A column indicating total acreage of each resource area has been added to Table 2-1.  Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.
225.055	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-9 - Define "practicable" in terms of days, months, or years.	Practicable in this instance is referring to the size of the mud pit, not a duration of time.
225.056	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-9 - Define "negligible" by quantity.	Negligible in this instance indicates that the amount of topsoil is so small that the mine operator uses topsoil substitute for all reclamation activities.
225.057	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-9 - Where is the off-site laboratory for analyzing soil samples? Why is it off-site?	Location of sample analysis facilities is at the discretion of the mine operator as part of a business decision, as long as samples are analyzed according to EPA approved methods and quality assurance controls.
225.058	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-10 - What is the toxicity of ammonium nitrate and fuel oil and what are the resulting impacts to the environment?	Explosives material is evaluated in Section 4.15 of the Draft EIS. Based on the GPS Product Safety Summary, ammonium nitrate has no been classified for acute or chronic toxicity, it is not considered genotoxic, there is no evidence of long-term carcinogenity, and no effects have been found on reproductive parameters. Further, it is not persistent or bioaccumulative in the environment.
225.059	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-11 - What percentage of coal ends up in spoil area?	Spoil consists of overburden and interburden materials as described on page 2-11. Approximately 8 percent of coals is left as wedges and ribs at the tops and bottoms of coal seams (see Section 2.1.2.6 of the Draft EIS)
225.060	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-11 - How long is field coal stockpiles held before transporting to the FCPP?	The permit application does not specify how long coal is held in the stockpiles; however, it is a continuous process: coal is added to the stockpile, segregated, hauled to FCPP, more coal is added. No change to the document.
225.061	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-11 -There are not four but five coal stockpile areas including the Bums Pass Temporary Coal Stockpile in Area II. Is the temporary stockpile area considered active? This "Temporary" stockpile created in 2007, seven years ago, "has yet to be used" so why is it called "Temporary"? Apparently there is no justification for Primary Action 1 (proposed approval of SMCRA permit for the Pinabete Permit Area) since there is a stockpile which "has yet to be used" and contingency coal reserves in the Area II Hosteen and Yazzie Pits have not been mined? Also only Units 4 and 5 will be operative. What are environmental impacts of stockpiling?	The temporary stockpile location is not currently active. As described on page 2-11 there are currently four active stockpiles and the temporary stockpile location is intended to add additional capacity when the Hosteen and Barber coal stockpiles near capacity. The purpose and need for the proposed action is described in Section 1.3. The environmental impacts of the stockpiles are addressed in Section 4.3, Earth Resources, and 4.5, Water Resources.
225.062	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-11 -Define "operationally beneficial."	In this context, the use of the temporary stockpile may be beneficial to the Navajo Mine operations.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
225.063	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-12 - Are sales and resale associated with personal use of coal stockpiled for employees and local Chapter residents? List local Chapters.	The Navajo Mine provides a stockpile of coal for personal use. The mine does not sell this coal. Any resale of the coal collected by employees or local chapter residents is outside the scope of this EIS.
225.064	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-12 - Table 2-4 must depict total tons and total acres mined.	Table 2-4 does provide total tons and total acres mined per year.
225.065	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-12 - Why is the coal not cleaned?	The coal is separated from the other geological formations sufficient to meet the acceptance requirements of the FCPP.
225.066	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-12 - Define, in quantities per year, "small" amount of water used for dust suppression and housekeeping purposes.	As described on page 4.5-32, BNCC used approximately 301 acre-feet of water per year for dust control purposes and 340 acre-feet of water per year for irrigation of reclaimed areas in 2011 (BNCC 2012d). The previous year, water use was approximately double with 633 acre-feet used for dust control and 1,166 acre-feet for irrigation (BNCC 2011b). The following text has been added to Section 2.1.4: Based on a review of recent records, approximately 300-600 acre-feet of water was used per year for dust control purposes.
225.067	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-12 - How is evaporation in Pond 1 measured?	It is not directly measured, but can be derived qualitatively.
225.068	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-12 - What assurances are provided that "no water or coal" plant wastes is discharged from the facility area and what federal agency monitors this periodically?	Discharge of water and wastes is regulated under Section 402 of the Clean Water Act and all discharges are permitted through the EPA National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System. As described on page 4.5-1, both the Navajo Mine and FCPP hold NPDES permits for their respective operations.
225.069	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-12 - Are the ponds, sedimentation and Pond 1, lined? If not, why not?	The sediment ponds at Navajo Mine are unlined. The ponds at Navajo Mine are not percolation ponds. The characteristics of the soils at Navajo Mine would create low permeability for the ponds. Most of the runoff captured by the ponds at Navajo Mine is lost to evaporation.
225.070	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-13 - How much water per year is used for dust suppression?	As described on page 4.5-32, BNCC used approximately 301 acre-feet of water per year for dust control purposes and 340 acre-feet of water per year for irrigation of reclaimed areas in 2011 (BNCC 2012d). The previous year, water use was approximately double with 633 acre-feet used for dust control and 1,166 acre-feet for irrigation (BNCC 2011b). The following text has been added to Section 2.1.4: Based on a review of recent records, approximately 300-600 acre-feet of water was used per year for dust control purposes.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
225.071	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-13 - How much surface water per year runs off from active mining and reclamation areas to the mine pit, sump, or sediment pond? What air quality contamination occurs from evaporation of retained water?	Surface water runoff varies annually based on weather conditions and precipitation. Section 4.5 describes the capacity of each pond and ability to retain sediment. Air quality is addressed in Section 4.1 of the Draft EIS. Metals and other constituents bind to the sediment and soil that collects in the pond. As described on page 4.3-17 soils within the Navajo Mine lease area meet soil suitability criteria for selenium, boron, and pH and potentially acid- or toxic-forming materials are not widespread. Therefore, evaporation of the water does not result in air quality contamination.
225.072	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-13 - Do SMCRA and/or CWA require annual monitoring and measurement of the discharge?	CWA NPDES permits require periodic monitoring and measurement of discharge, as described in Section 4.5 of the Draft EIS.
225.073	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-14 - Does NTEC line its diversions, sediment ponds, detention ponds, and impoundments? If not, why not?	The sediment ponds at Navajo Mine are unlined. The ponds at Navajo Mine are not percolation ponds. The characteristics of the soils at Navajo Mine would create low permeability for the ponds. Most of the runoff captured by the ponds at Navajo Mine is lost to evaporation.
225.074	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-14 - What is the history (in quantities per year) of any point source discharges from these engineered diversion structures and were these subject to NPDES regulations?	Point source discharges are subject to NPDES regulations. As described in Section 4.5, both FCPP and Navajo Mine operate under Clean Water Act NPDES permits. NPDES permits do not regulate the quantity of water discharged, rather the concentration of pollutants that is allowed within the discharge.
225.075	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-18 - Morgan Lake can be retired and reclaimed in the No Action Alternative, therefore, no longer disturbing the San Juan River, and subjecting the River to receiving discharges/flows from FCPP via Morgan Lake, No Name Wash, and Chaco Wash. The San Juan River is a sacred "Site" but the EIS does not state so. The EIS does not provide a definition of sacred sites. There are no assurances on Page 2-23 that water used to cool condensers/equipment is not contaminated when it is allowed to flow into the unlined Morgan Lake and back into the San Juan River. Man-made lakes are not natural therefore not condoned by the Biosphere.	As described on page 3-32, under the No Action Alternative Morgan Lake would evaporate over time and cease to exist. Discharges from the cooling condensers is regulated under the NPDES permit for the FCPP, as described in Section 4.5. It is correct that Morgan Lake is a man-made lake. It is an approved feature of the FCPP per the lease agreement with the Navajo Nation. OSMRE has no data to support that San Juan River is a sacred "Site". No change to the EIS.
225.076	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-22 - Is there an emergency plan for use of lime slurry storage tanks? Does the emergency plan (natural disaster or other cause) for the FCPP and the Navajo Mine Energy Project contain transportation routes for any toxic materials transported to and from the FCPP?	Emergency action plans for the FCPP and Navajo Mine are addressed in Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS. The Emergency action plan for the FCPP addresses potential failure of the lined ash impoundment and lined decant water pond.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
225.077	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-24 - State, in quantity or percentage, the "portion" of the fly ash sold for reuse. List vendors.	Beneficial reuse of CCRs is currently occurring at FCPP, as described in Section 2.2.6.3. In 1997, a vendor began purchasing and transporting 240,000 tons per year (or approximately 20% of total CCRs) for creating concrete. Therefore, this action is already considered as part of the existing environment and accounted for in the EIS. Further, this is the only vendor that has expressed interest in purchasing fly ash and it is presumed that market demand for beneficial reuse of CCRs from FCPP is being met..
225.078	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-27 - Apparently OSMRE is opposed to EPA's consideration of new regulations that would fully consider the risks, management practices and other pertinent information related to fly ash.	EPA published its Final Rule for Hazardous and Solid Waste Management System; Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals from Electrical Utilities on December 19, 2014. The Final EIS has been updated accordingly to reflect this new rule and its applicability to the FCPP. A comprehensive discussion of the rule, its provisions, and enforceability is provided in Section 4.15, Hazardous Materials and Wastes. In addition, specific provisions of the rule that apply to other resource areas (i.e., Water and Air) are included in Sections 4.1, 4.5, 4.11, 4.17, and 4.18.
225.079	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-27 - Was the January 2014 deadline to discontinue hydrazine storage on-site implemented?	There was no regulatory deadline to discontinue hydrazine storage on-site. The storage was discontinued as part of a business decision by the operators of FCPP as a result of the shut-down of Units 1, 2, and 3. Hydrazine is not needed to operate Units 4 or 5.
225.080	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-28 - Breakdown Indian trust lands by tribe (Navajo Nation and Hopi Tribe) concerning the total 4,330 acres.	Have added breakdown of Navajo and Hopi acreage along the Moenkopi transmission line ROW.
225.081	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-33 - The codified version of the law signed by President Ben Shelly on April 30, 2013 must be cited. This is an irresponsible piece of legislation which was not subject to Navajo citizens' public participation such as by referendum or public hearing. The unfortunate legislation walks, talks and acts like the 1921 Navajo legislation that created the Navajo Tribal Council in order to approve a mineral lease generated by the federal government for the benefit of certain companies and a U.S. war economy. Why would the Navajo Nation want to acquire facilities and mining activities which have a history of permanently depleting coal? Why would the Navajo Nation want to acquire portions or eventually all of FCPP which has a long standing history of unregulated mining and FCPP operation activities, i.e., Pre-1977 in the Pre-Law jurisdiction resource area?	It is beyond the scope of this EIS to comment on legislation passed by the Navajo Nation Tribal Council. However, specific reference to the Navajo Codified Legislation (No. 0116-13) has been added to Section 2.4.1.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
225.082	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-33 - Why would EPA recommend changing the land use designation of reclaimed lands to support livestock grazing when the Presidents of the United States (War Department, General Land Office, and Interior Secretaries) have a history of anti-livestock grazing policies since 1868?	As stated on page 2-33, EPA has suggested that NTEC consider development of renewable energy on reclaimed lands of the Navajo Mine.  This use would require a change to the existing land use designation, which supports livestock grazing. Thus EPA is suggesting that instead of livestock grazing, the land use designation be changed to a category that supports energy development.
225.083	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-33 - BNCC's plans to transfer its SMCRA permit to NTEC would be contingent upon BNCC also relinquishing its water rights to the San Juan River? That is, the transfer of BNCC water rights to the Navajo Nation?	The transfer of the SMCRA permit to NTEC did not include the transfer of water rights. The water right permit will continue to be held by BBNMC as stated on page 2-34.
225.084	Ms.	Rosemari	Knoki	Knoki Research Associates	5/20/2014	Page 2-34 - Define "certain" and "will" in the following statement: NTEC will acquire certain mineral and property rights from NMCC: . . . -Clarify why NTEC and not the Navajo Nation would acquire such mineral and property rights? Wouldn't the proposed NTEC acquisition of such rights create a new split estate between the Navajo Nation and NTEC? The Navajo Nation (Tribe) is the appropriate party for acquisition of any mineral and property rights from NMCC not the NTEC, the latter apparently a tribal enterprise.	As stated in Section 2.4.1, "the Navajo Nation has been and will continue to be the owner and the lessor of the land and minerals. NTEC, the new SMCRA permit holder, will continue the surface mining and reclamation activities at the Navajo Mine." The certain mineral and property rights refer to the authorizations to continue mining operations under NTEC as opposed to NMCC.
226.001	Ms.	Diana	Speer		5/28/2014	Winds carry the polluted, toxic exhaust from coal burning great distances, however it is most concentrated nearer the source of emissions. Meaning to the children and families of those working near the four corners power plant itself.	Thank you for your comment. Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS addresses potential impacts with regard to Health and Safety, including worker safety. Pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarize the human health risk assessment conducted for the project.
226.002	Ms.	Diana	Speer		5/28/2014	Please recommend generating power from clean solar energy and leave the coal in the ground where it is safely out of our lungs, brains and guts, and those of our families and children.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives
227.001	Ms.	Jennifer	Ward		5/29/2014	The goal is economic growth and Navajo Mine plays a key role in Farmington for people to achieve financial stability and give back.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
228.001	Mr.	George	Kelly		5/8/2014	BHP is very important to the community as the company and the employees contribute to the SJ United Way and the Navajo United Way in thousands of dollars... Without BHP the economy of the San Juan County and the Navajo Nation will suffer in many ways.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
229.001	Mr.	Brian	Hoffman		5/25/2014	It's disturbing to think that the dirty plants in our region will be permitted until 2041? Please deny permits for coal activity - plants, mining, lease extensions. If you must put a short period, say 5 years to let opponents know that coal has got to be reduced.	Thank you for your comment. Please see Master Response #3, Alternatives with Shorter Lease Term
229.002	Mr.	Brian	Hoffman		5/25/2014	Why can't we use all the gas that is in our region for power?	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives
230.001	Mr.	Billy	Harrison		5/30/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
231.001	Ms.	Stephanie	Johnson		5/3/2014	The lives of communities, especially nearer to these operations, have borne the brunt of health risks. We all bear health risks of these activities. It is time for these creative scientists and engineers to serve our country by invention and production of alternative sources of clean energy.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives
232.001	Mr.	Shawn	Benally		5/7/2014	It is my belief that other Navajo employees that are currently employed at both the Plant and the mine appreciate the fact that both these enterprises provide a good-paying job with benefits close to home and family. IN addition to the personal impact that working at the plant has had on me, these two enterprises as have a great positive impact to the local community. For example, the taxes and royalties paid by these two operations is a significant portion of the Navajo Nations' Gross national product. In addition, the employees who work at these two corporations are compassionate people and they contribute to the local organizations, such a Navajo United Way and San Juan United Way. These are only two examples of how these two operations contribute to the community. The economic impact would just not be possible with these to operations not being in existence.	Thank you for your comment.
232.002	Mr.	Shawn	Benally		5/7/2014	Finally, Four Corners has worked to voluntarily reduce particulate and SO2 emissions since the early 1970s. Voluntary mercury and Nox emissions soon followed in the late 1980s and 90s. Four Corners proposal to comply with the BART regulations by shutting down units 1, 2, and 3 and installing SCRs on Units 4 and 5 will finally address the significant NOx emissions from Four Corners. The Large NOx emissions have been difficult to address all these years until now. BART regulations will finally allow four corners to become a cleaner coal plant. This final effort to reduce emissions to comply with stricter environmental regulations should most definitely provide the justification for Four Corners to continue operations beyond 2016.	Thank you for your comment. The Federal Implementation Plan for FCPP is a separate action conducted by the EPA and is incorporated as part of the baseline environmental setting in the Draft EIS. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.
233.001	Mr.	Edward	Michael	Chairman, Board of commisioners	5/9/2014	The power plan t and mine are major economic contributors for the norther we Mexico region, with an annual payroll exceeding \$800 million dollars. BHP Billiton, operator of the Navajo Mine, spends\$130 million annually on suppliers and vendors and \$1.6 million in community donations. The loss of these operations would be devastating to this community, both at the family, local and state level. Negative fiscal impacts include the inability of employees to provide family support and greatly reduced personal, corporate, and gross receipts taxes, as well as severance, observation, and resource excise taxes...In new mexico, i doubt that any community could withstand the loss of 1,000 jobs and the direct, indirect and induced economic benefits contributable to the operatios of the four corners power plant and the Navajo Mine. I encourage the extension of the operations for the economic health and well being of northern New Mexico families and businesses as well as the State of New Mexico.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
234.001	Mr.	Eric	Epp	BHP Billiton	6/2/2014	This reclamation reduces sediment runoff to waterways, and requires little to no long term maintenance, because it is erosionally stable over geologic time. The Geo-Fluvial form of 'geomorphic' reclamation is an industry leading practice....During every tour I have ever given of La Plata Mine, I have heard a variation of the statement, "You wouldn't know anyone had ever mined here." Because NMC has adopted the same reclamation practices from La Plata Mine at its Navajo and San Juan Mines, there is no reason to believe that visitors won't be making similar comments when the Navajo and San Juan Mines have long since closed. Generations from now, the land on which NMC mined and reclaimed will remain erosionally stable. In addition, the majority of the land that NMC reclaims has vegetation cover and diversity values that, at least meet, if not exceed, the values of the land in pre-mined condition. (This statement can be verified by reviewing bond release application packages from NMC operations.) By utilizing proper rangeland management practices, the land will sustainably support livestock use. The U.S. Bureau of Land Management has already declared that many of the areas under its ownership, which NMC leased for coal mining, will be set aside as special wildlife management areas, upon bond release, because of the exceptional grazing habitat created by the reclamation.	The DEIS notes the benefits of geomorphic restoration techniques, and the timing of their implementation at the Navajo Mine.
234.002	Mr.	Eric	Epp	BHP Billiton	6/2/2014	In the debate over climate change, one has to weigh social justice with environmental stewardship. (The environmental movement often argues that it has the corner on the social justice market... If the mines and power plants were shut down, over a thousand Navajo, earning steady salaries, with health care and retirement benefits, would go unemployed. The follow-on effects to the rest of the community and the region would be profound.	Thank you for your comment. Climate Change is addressed in Section 4.2 of the Draft EIS, as well as in Section 4.18, Cumulative Impacts. Socioeconomics is addressed in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
234.003	Mr.	Eric	Epp	BHP Billiton	6/2/2014	My suggested solution to transforming society to the environmental outcomes a response to climate change demands would be to take a more moderate approach. The key to this would be to let the plants die a natural death. They have a finite lifespan. If coal must be replaced, let it be a generational shift. The Four Corners Power Plant recently shut down three of its furnaces built in the 1960s and plans to upgrade its two remaining units to have lower emissions. Those units will come to the end of their design lifespan in the 2040s. Declaring 2041 (the end of the lease extension being proposed in the FCPP-NEP EIS) as a hard closure date now would give the Navajo Nation and San Juan County approximately 25 years to figure out what options it has to replace those jobs with new economic opportunities. It will give the community that depends on the mines and power plant time to retrain, retool, and give a new generation a new set of economic expectations by the time of the power plant's closure	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.
234.004	Mr.	Eric	Epp	BHP Billiton	6/2/2014	Continued operation of the FCPP and Navajo Mine will preserve jobs and the economy in the region for decades.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
234.005	Mr.	Eric	Epp	BHP Billiton	6/2/2014	The required reductions to the FCPP's emissions will improve air quality.	Thank you for your comment. A description of the change in air emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Section 4.1.3 of the Draft EIS.
234.006	Mr.	Eric	Epp	BHP Billiton	6/2/2014	The environmental benefit of geomorphic reclamation by NMC is proven and will last indefinitely.	Thank you for your comment. A description of reclamation activities at the Navajo Mine is provided in Section 3.2.1.1 of the Draft EIS.
234.007	Mr.	Eric	Epp	BHP Billiton	6/2/2014	I advocate for approval of the Proposed Actions being considered for the long term operation of the FCPP and Navajo Mine.	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.
234.008	Mr.	Eric	Epp	BHP Billiton	6/2/2014	Appendix D, Pages D-2 and D-3, Photos 3,4,5, 6., the author categorizes the plume emitted from the FCPP as 'smoke'. Smoke is made up of particulate matter as a result of combustion. FCPP is equipped with baghouses that capture most of the particulate matter from coal combustion, but releases an enormous amount of steam. It would be more accurate to categorize the visible white plume as 'steam'.	The term "smoke" is used in a generic sense to indicate the visible emissions from the smokestacks of the power plant. The comment is correct that the emissions from the power plant is primarily steam. However, in the context of the referenced appendix, the term "smoke" is appropriate because the specific constituents of the emissions are not being analyzed. See section 4.1 for an analysis of the air emissions from the power plant.
234.009	Mr.	Eric	Epp	BHP Billiton	6/2/2014	<p>Page 4.3-4, in the final paragraph on the page, the author writes that [the Grants Mineral Belt] is home to numerous minerals. A more appropriate phrasing would be to write 'This belt hosts numerous mineral deposits.'</p> <p>In addition the author writes: 'A large reserve of uranium exists within the Grants Mineral Belt.' The use of the term 'reserve' in this case is inaccurate, because a mineral or ore 'reserve' is defined as: valuable and legally and economically and technically feasible to extract. Later in the paragraph the author writes that 'However, uranium is no longer extracted in New Mexico because it has been deemed uneconomical.'</p> <p>Though an increase in price, or shift in public perception or government policy on mining, might allow the uranium to be economically extracted, at this time it would be more appropriate to report that 'deposits' or 'occurrences' of uranium exist within the Grants Mineral Belt'.</p> <p>Page 4.3-12, In paragraph 1 on this page, a sentence reads 'The primary fossil yields from this formation include some of the earliest mammal and plant fossils found.' This isn't true. The Nacimiento Formation dates from the Paleocene Epoch. The first mammals evolved in the Triassic Period and vascular plants have existed since the Silurian Period. Both of these geologic periods occurred hundreds of millions of years prior to the Paleocene. The author may have intended the sentence to read something like, "...earliest mammal and plant fossils found (in the ROI), (in the post-Cretaceous), or (in the Paleocene)..."</p>	Thank you for your comments. These revisions have been made to the Final EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
235.001	Mrs	Frances	Binkerhoff		6/2/2014	<p>I do not want the four corners power plant and navajo mine energy project renewed. We have so much pollution from those power plants. We cannot even see our XXX sometimes. It Is so bad we are told the fish in this this area of CO are not safe to eat from pollution of our waters in rivers and lakes. I personally am forced to be on oxygen from the many years i have been polluted by the smog and elements from coal burning power plants in NM and AZ blowing here.</p> <p>Please do not renew the project to slowly kill our citizens from coal burning pollution. We no long have frogs, snakes, lizards, toads, waters dogs as we used to have in our yards and area</p>	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015. With regard to mercury, please see Master Response #4, Mercury in Fish in Nearby Lakes. In addition, Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS addresses potential impacts with regard to Health and Safety, including worker safety. Pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarize the human health risk assessment conducted for the project.
236.001		Randy	Willis		6/2/2014	<p>please convince the parties involved in invest in clean, renewable energy projects. The pollution from the coal fired power plants is too much of a price to pay.</p>	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives
237.001	Ms	Marylin	T.	League of Women Voters of La Plata	6/3/2014	<p>We would prefer that capital planned for this project be redirected to energy conservation/efficiency and sourcing from renewables...Carbon dioxide, copiously emitted from the FCPP and all other coal-fired power plants, is now recognized as the most significant human-generated contribution to global warming. We encourage the OSM to weigh heavily the fact that approval of the mine expansion will stall for a significant period of time the transition to an alternative fuel (either natural gas or, better yet, renewable power sources)</p>	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015. With regard to renewable energy, please see Master Response #2.
237.002	Ms	Marylin	T.	League of Women Voters of La Plata	6/3/2014	<p>To date the FCPP has been producing the highest nitrogen oxide (NOx) emissions of any power plant in the country. NOx emissions are a key component of smog.</p> <p>Drier conditions are predicted for the Desert Southwest, which will accelerate dust storms carrying particulate matter and other pollutants long distances. Findings released from a mercury-monitoring project indicated a significant amount of mercury, a pollutant from burning coal, arriving under dry conditions in southwest Colorado, which impacts aquatic life and eventually human health.</p> <p>If approved, the proposed Pinabete Permit would expand the surface mining area up to 5,600 acres, which would increase the disturbed area allowing for transport of more particulates and pollutants.</p>	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015. With regard to consideration of environmental impacts, Master Response #4, Mercury Deposition and Fish in Nearby Lakes.
237.003	Ms	Marylin	T.	League of Women Voters of La Plata	6/3/2014	<p>The FCPP and Navajo Mine use large amounts of water. As drier conditions prevail in the Desert Southwest, utilization, as well as protection of the quality, of that scarce resource must be criteria in energy decisions. Surface mining disturbs the soil allowing pollutants to enter the environment by wind as well as runoff, potentially polluting surface and ground water sources.</p>	Thank you for your comment. Water resources, including water supply and runoff, are evaluated in Section 4.5 of the Draft EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
237.004	Ms	Marylin	T.	League of Women Voters of La Plata	6/3/2014	Increased oil and gas development, overgrazing, prolonged drought, and coal-fired power plant pollution have created a continual deterioration of the air and water quality with resultant impact on soil and vegetation in the Four Corners region. Mercury is in the local food chain as evidenced by the number of fish consumption advisories in the area. La Plata County, Colorado is home to five federally endangered or threatened species including the Mexican Spotted Owl, Southwestern Willow Flycatcher, and lynx (wildlife.state.co.us). Many more are listed as State endangered and threatened. Changes in vegetation, pollutants, and climate change in general, impact wildlife habitat and food supplies further threatening the populations of species struggling to survive.	Thank you for your comment. Regarding mercury, please see Master Response #4, Mercury in Fish in Nearby Lakes. Threatened and endangered species are addressed in Section 4.8 of the Draft EIS.
237.005	Ms	Marylin	T.	League of Women Voters of La Plata	6/3/2014	The health effects of pollutants from the FCPP have been highly publicized. Forty-four premature deaths, 800 asthma attacks, 2 asthma-related emergency-room visits with an estimated cost of more than \$341 million are attributed to its air pollution (www.catf.us/coal/problems/power_plants/existing/map.php?state=New_Mexico). Health impacts to miners at the Navajo Mine create an additional cost by reduced life expectancy, congestive heart failure, black lung disease, and asthma attacks. While the Navajo Mine is a surface mine, we were recently reminded of the dangers miners face, especially in deep mines, as they work to supply coal to coalfired power plants across the nation and the world.	Thank you for your comment. Health and safety, including worker safety, is addressed in Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS. The human health risk assessment conducted for the project is summarized on pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24.
237.006	Ms	Marylin	T.	League of Women Voters of La Plata	6/3/2014	The Four Corners region, which is impacted by the FCPP and the Navajo Mine, is primarily rural with small towns and has a large Native American population on four tribal lands. Many residents of the Navajo Nation do not have electric power even as they live under or near the transmission lines from the FCPP. We ask that you address your responsibilities under Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, and Executive Order 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks, to protect the affected population in the region.	Environmental justice is addressed in Section 4.11 of the Draft EIS.
237.007	Ms	Marylin	Brown	League of Women Voters of La Plata	6/3/2014	The Navajo Nation is rich in natural resources, including its people, the wind and the sun. Investing in a clean-energy future would create new jobs for those displaced by the reduction in the use of coal. The LWVLP encourages the OSM to consider all environmental, health, and socioeconomic impacts and to choose environmentally preferable alternatives to the proposed actions for the FCPP and Navajo Mine. Now is the time to move toward a cleaner energy future that benefits the Navajo Nation, the Four Corners region, and the nation. We must begin to get used to the idea of leaving our more problematic sources of energy in the ground where they belong.	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.
238.001	Mr.	Randy	Willis		6/3/2014	No Substantive comment about EIS	Thank you for your comment.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
239.001	Ms	Suzanne	Hutzler		6/4/2014	I have never experienced such pollution in all my years of life. Please place your energy in Solar.I am totally against leasing this 1960's type of pollution any longer. I am totally against a renewal permit from Arizona Public Service Co. through 2041. Please develop (5,600 acres) solar panels rather than develop new coal mining area known as the Pinabete Mine Permit area.Please only renew the Navajo Transitional Energy Co. for the Navajo Coal Mine located on the Navajo Reservation in San Juan County, N.M. with the provision to shut it down and use a safer method.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives
240.001	Mr	Ryan	Osborne		6/7/2014	As reliable as the energy the plant creates are its waste emissions that disperse daily and contaminate the food and water supply of the four states, even here in the mountains, at the headwaters that we try to keep pristine for the favor of all downstream. It is no longer recommended that the fish be eaten from our streams, rivers, and lakes because of the bioaccumulation of toxic sediment produced by the power plants.	Thank you for your comment. Water resources, including water supply and runoff, are evaluated in Section 4.5 of the Draft EIS. With regard to fish, please see Master Response #4, Mercury in Fish in Nearby Lakes
240.002	Mr	Ryan	Osborne		6/7/2014	Whereas the clear days once prevailed, the days grow more rare that famous Shiprock can be viewed from here.The haze created by the plant is particularly evident in the winter, when the demand for electricity is high, and the warm air inversions condense the airborne refuse in the atmospheric strata.	Thank you for your comment. For clarification, the FCPP operates at the same capacity year-round and provides baseload power. Operation of the facility does not fluctuate with demand. Section 4.1 of the Draft EIS addresses air quality and visibility.
240.003	Mr	Ryan	Osborne		6/7/2014	It is easy to track the culprit of our children's dry throats and coughs straight to the stacks of the APS Four Corners plant. The region wide, compound health effects of such continued exposure cannot be measured with any sort of economic efficiency, and certainly not treated. Though it is certain that data exists showing disproportionately high levels of respiratory, and other illness down wind of the power plants.	Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS addresses health and safety; specifically, pages 4.17-22 through 4/17-24 summarize the results of the human health risk assessment conducted for the project.
240.004	Mr	Ryan	Osborne		6/7/2014	The time is past nigh that we realize that coal fire technology is no longer affordable in light of cleaner and more renewable energy sources such as solar, geo thermal, and wind. Not to mention the scars the mining makes on the land, which cannot be fully restored in a human lifetime. It is my request that you act with the most stringent environmental and regulatory standards available, and do all you can to incentivize, the transition for clean energy here in the Four Corners, and in the farthest reaches of your jurisdiction to the present and long-term benefit of any and all under the sun.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives
241.001	Mr.	Eric	Miller	Professor of Chemistry San Juan College	6/10/2014	No Substantive comment about EIS	Thank you for your comment.
242.001	Mr.	Jack	Fortner	Board of County Commisioners of San Juan County, NM	5/6/2014	Once fully implemented, environmental improvement projects to be installed at the FCPP will result in the reduction of emissions above and beyond those realized by the recent closure of units 1-3, including a 30% reduction in CO2 emissions and projected reduction in FCPP water use by almost 2 billion gallons per year.	Thank you for your comment. For clarification, the Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the environmental baseline in this NEPA process. A discussion of the changes in historic baseline as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in each resource area discussion in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
242.002	Mr.	Jack	Fortner	Board of County Commissioners of San Juan County, NM	5/6/2014	The proposed project will have a significant annual direct impact on San Juan County, through the preservation of 785 jobs, income generation from direct labor of approximately 102 million dollars, and gross state project for San Juan County in an approximate amount of 288 million	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
242.003	Mr.	Jack	Fortner	Board of County Commissioners of San Juan County, NM	5/6/2014	Be it resolved by the board of San Juan County Commissioners, that the board affirms its support of the renewal of the FCPP lease, rights of way, and associated mining operations. Be it further resolved that the board of San Juan County Commissioners finds and concludes that the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine Energy Project will have significant economic and environmental benefit to San Juan County	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.
243.001	Ms.	Kathleen	Martyn Goforth	EPA, Region IX	6/26/2014	Our concerns regard the existing contamination of groundwater from coal combustion residue (CCR) disposal and the need for enforceable commitments regarding future CCR management, monitoring and remediation. We also have concerns regarding the assessment of cumulative health impacts from continued operation of the project, given the severely compromised existing public health environment.	Section 4.5 contains a detailed discussion of the existing environment for groundwater conditions, which accounts for prior placement of CCRs in the Navajo Mine as fill/reclamation materials and CCR disposal at the FCPP. In addition, the following language regarding future management of CCR disposal at the FCPP has been added to Section 4.5.4.1: In accordance with the Final Rule for Disposal of CCR at Electric Utilities, APS will continue groundwater monitoring at the ash disposal area at FCPP, on at least a semi-annual basis and data will be analyzed to detect potential leaching. If sample analysis determines the presence of leaching, APS will take implement appropriate corrective measures, as outlined in the Final Rule. Groundwater monitoring records will be kept in the FCPP operating records and posted on a public website, as specified in the Final Rule.  Section 4.15.1 provides also extensive discussion of the regulatory requirements for the management of CCR. Please see response to comment 243.009 for additional information on cumulative health effects.
243.002	Ms.	Kathleen	Martyn Goforth	EPA, Region IX	6/26/2014	Because future regulations by EPA regarding CCR management may not apply on Tribal lands, we strongly recommend that the voluntary measures be incorporated as conditions of approval by the BIA in the event it approves APS's proposed lease amendment and application for right-of-way renewals. Groundwater contamination from past disposal of CCR in Navajo Mine has also occurred and we recommend monitoring of groundwater at the Navajo Mine to confirm the DEIS conclusions that constituents of concern would be attenuated as groundwater travels towards the San Juan River and the Chaco Rivers.	EPA published its Final Rule for Hazardous and Solid Waste Management System; Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals from Electrical Utilities on December 19, 2014. The Final EIS has been updated accordingly to reflect this new rule and its applicability to the FCPP. A comprehensive discussion of the rule, its provisions, and enforceability is provided in Section 4.15, Hazardous Materials and Wastes. In addition, specific provisions of the rule that apply to other resource areas (i.e., Water and Air) are included in Sections 4.1, 4.5, 4.11, 4.17, and 4.18.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
243.003	Ms.	Kathleen	Martyn Goforth	EPA, Region IX	6/26/2014	<p>The DEIS concludes that that cumulative impacts to public health from both the FCPP and the Mine would be minor. Emissions of some pollutants from the power plant will be reduced as a result of EPA's Federal Implementation Plan - Best Available Retrofit Technology, and these reductions are expected to have a positive impact on public health. Nevertheless, as disclosed in the DETS, health outcomes for Navajo, in term of life expectancy and mortality rates, are worse than for the general population in San Juan County, partly due to healthcare disparities. The cumulative health burden also includes the impacts from in-home burning of coal that is provided by the Navajo Mine to local tribal members free or at low-cost. This coal is often burned in improperly-vented stoves not designed to burn coal. Because many Navajo do not have access, or affordable access, to electricity, the provision of free or cheap coal by the project directly contributes to the cumulative health burden from indoor exposure to coal smoke. We recommend that the Final EIS incorporate the severely compromised existing public health environment into its cumulative health impacts assessment and include commitments to mitigation for the project's contribution to the ongoing environmental justice and cumulative health impacts. Please see the enclosed Detailed Comments for our commendations regarding mitigation.</p>	<p>As stated in the comment, the Draft EIS discusses current state of human health specifically for the Navajo Nation (see Section 4.7.2). This existing condition is taken into account when considering potential effects from permitting the continued operations of the project. For mitigating potential indoor air quality effects from Navajo members burning coal available in improper stoves, please see response to comment 243.009.</p>
243.004	Ms.	Kathleen	Martyn Goforth	EPA, Region IX	6/26/2014	<p><u>CCR management at the Four Corners Power Plant</u></p> <p>EPA expects to finalize the CCR rule by the end of 2014, which will determine whether CCR is managed as hazardous waste under Subtitle C of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), as solid waste under Subtitle D of RCRA, or in some other manner. The DEIS indicates that CCR at the Four Corners Power Plant will be managed in accordance with this final EPA determination, and notes that, if EPA regulates CCR through Subtitle D, the authority to implement the regulations would be at the state level, which would not apply on tribal lands (p. 4.15-5). OSM proposes mitigation to address this regulatory gap, and we agree this is necessary. However, the DEIS identifies the mitigation measures as voluntary recommendations to Arizona Public Service, while also portraying them as if they were legal requirements. For example, on page 4.15-27, the DEIS states that both new and existing disposal units would be subject to groundwater monitoring requirements and, if certain hazardous constituents are detected at a level exceeding groundwater protection standards, the FCPP would have 90 days to assess corrective measures and select a remedy that would protect human health and the environment. It is not clear what groundwater protection standards are being referenced. The DEIS notes that the Navajo Nation does not have groundwater quality standards (p. 4.15-18). Additionally, the specific timeline and reference to corrective measures imply a rigorous enforcement program. The hazardous and solid waste mitigation measures on pages 4.15-31 through 4.15- 32 reference a "permit program" and "inspection requirements" and specify operating, design, groundwater monitoring, corrective action, and closure and post-closure</p>	<p>EPA published its Final Rule for Hazardous and Solid Waste Management System; Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals from Electrical Utilities on December 19, 2014. The Final EIS has been updated accordingly to reflect this new rule and its applicability to the FCPP. A comprehensive discussion of the rule, its provisions, and enforceability is provided in Section 4.15, Hazardous Materials and Wastes. In addition, specific provisions of the rule that apply to other resource areas (i.e., Water and Air) are included in Sections 4.1, 4.5, 4.11, 4.17, and 4.18.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p>requirements, but these “requirements” are simply recommendations to APS (“OSMRE recommends APS implement the measures below” – p. 4.15-31).</p> <p>Recommendations: The hazardous and solid waste mitigation measures presented on pages 4.15-31 through 4.15- 32 should be enforceable conditions of the project since it is a possibility that coal ash could be regulated under Subtitle D and the standards would not have an enforcement agency on tribal lands. We strongly agree with the need for the identified operating, design, groundwater monitoring, corrective action, and closure and post-closure requirements. Office of Surface Mining, Reclamation and Enforcement does not have a federal action at the FCPP, but the BIA is a cooperating agency and is using this EIS to inform its decision on the FCPP lease renewal. The hazardous and solid waste mitigation measures should be conditions of BIA’s lease approval and enforceable through BIA’s lease conditions and its NEPA Record of Decision. We recommend that they be identified as such in the Final EIS.</p>	
243.005	Ms.	Kathleen	Martyn Goforth	EPA, Region IX	6/26/2014	<p>Contamination from past CCR mine disposal Contamination from coal combustion residue (CCR) placed at the Navajo Mine has leached, and will continue to leach, directly into groundwater of the Fruitland Formation coal seams and the Pictured Cliffs Sandstone Formation. The DEIS acknowledges “high levels of chemical constituents of concern exist within the wells in the historic mining area” (p. 4.5-44). The DEIS concludes, however, that “Thus far, negligible impacts have resulted from the CCR placement. It is also unlikely that any significant future effects will ensue from the CCR placement at the Navajo Mine because of the very slow groundwater movement and the likely attenuation of contaminants of concern as they migrate through the subsurface” and that “Therefore, past CCR placement at the Navajo Mine is determined to have no impact in the short- or long-term” (p. 4.5-14). Elsewhere it states that the potential impacts to current and future water uses from CCR placement at the Navajo Mine are minor (p. 4.5-44), despite the identified major impacts for pH, boron, selenium, fluoride and sulfate (p. 4.5-44), with concentrations of boron, fluoride, sulfate, and total dissolved solids (TDS) exceeding the criteria for livestock watering, a designated post reclamation land use.</p> <p>These conclusions, especially that of “no impact”, do not appear to be supported. The modeling assumption that contaminants would be attenuated as they migrate through the subsurface has not been confirmed. Additionally, the assumption that pollutants would be diluted by the larger San Juan River groundwater flow, even if they are not attenuated during transport to the Fruitland Formation, is brought into question since the transport modeling and sampling that occurred seems to have not fully recognized the possibility of a significant vertical (fracture) flow in the Fruitland Formation. The DEIS indicates that the general flow direction of groundwater in the Fruitland Formation is downward through the interbedded shale and coal units to the lower strata of the Fruitland Formation, with marginal upward movement from</p>	<p>Monitoring wells in Areas I and II of the Navajo Mine Lease area have been added to Figure 4.5-1 and to Table 4.5-3 of the Draft EIS (now Table 4.5-4 in the Final EIS), as well as Table 4.5-6. These wells were displayed on Figure 4.5-3 of the Draft EIS. As stated in the Draft EIS, the groundwater quality within the Navajo Mine lease area (in both areas that are actively mined and those that have not yet been mined) exceed the criteria for livestock watering; however, as shown on Figure 4.5-1, there are no livestock watering wells within Areas I and II.</p> <p>As described in the EIS, historic and current livestock watering in the vicinity of the permit area has been limited to surface and alluvial systems. Groundwater monitoring data does not indicate that CCR disposal has compromised groundwater quality for livestock use in Area I or II. Rather groundwater monitoring data shows that baseline/background Fruitland and PCS water quality has never met livestock criteria and has never been used for livestock watering. Additionally, the limited data available in the Bitsui alluvium which has been used historically for livestock watering indicates that water quality upgradient of all historic mining and CCR placement was of marginal quality for livestock use. Therefore, the only anticipated future use of groundwater in the area is for oil and gas purposes. The EIS has been revised to provide this explanation as well. In addition, review of baseline monitoring wells in Areas IVN and IVS indicate that water quality in the alluvium and Fruitland Formation is not suitable for livestock watering.</p> <p>The Final EIS was revised to reflect vertical fracture flow as follows: Further, transport directions for mine spoil water would be laterally down dip in the Fruitland Formation, toward the outcrop areas to the south and west of Area III, and vertically into the Pictured Cliff Sandstone. Lateral flow from the mine spoils through the Fruitland Formation and vertical fracture flow into the Pictured Cliff Sandstone is very low due to the low</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p>the Pictured Cliffs Sandstone into the Fruitland Formation (p. 4.5-13). One can infer from the vertical flow directions that fracture flow might play a prominent role in the movement of bedrock groundwater in the FCPP area. This parameter was not considered in the groundwater modeling of the FCPP area. If vertical (and lateral) fracture flow is substantial, the assumed attenuation would not occur because fracture flow results in a much smaller residence time of groundwater in the bedrock formations and a limited opportunity for the contaminants to be adsorbed by bedrock clay. This would lead to a potentially larger groundwater impact downgradient of CCR placement than is predicted in the DEIS.</p> <p>The DEIS is not clear whether any ongoing groundwater or surface water monitoring would occur as a condition of this project. The DEIS seems to indicate that only groundwater and surface water monitoring that are part of the new SMCRA permit groundwater monitoring plan (originally from BHP Navajo Coal Company, but which the Navajo Transitional Energy Company will implement) would occur, which relates to the new mine areas and the Pinabete and Cottonwood arroyos. It does not specify any monitoring of the historic contamination areas nor confirm that contaminated groundwater is not reaching the San Juan or Chaco River surface water or alluvia. Recommendation: The FEIS should include additional information to support its groundwater and surface water impact assessment conclusions. We recommend that monitoring of groundwater quality at Areas I and II of the Navajo Mine and the San Juan River alluvium occur to confirm the model predictions that constituents of concern would be attenuated as groundwater travels towards the San Juan River and the Chaco River. Because the groundwater of the Fruitland and Pictured Cliffs Sandstone formations that enter into the alluvium also discharges into the San Juan River in the area of the Navajo Mine, monitoring of the San Juan River surface water quality upstream, along the mine reach, and downstream should occur if the groundwater monitoring results identify elevated levels of pollutants in the San Juan River alluvium that exceed Navajo Nation Water Quality Standards. In addition, the baseline groundwater quality should be clarified. The DEIS summarizes baseline results for Cottonwood, Pinabete, and No Name Arroyo alluvial wells in Table 4.5-5; however the presentation of this information is not useful. EPA previously commented that this summary</p> <p>does not allow an assessment of ground water impacts by source, and we recommended including some monitoring results by well in the DEIS. In addition, the identification/location of these baseline wells is of importance in order to confirm they do, indeed, represent baseline conditions and do not include contamination that is related to past CCR disposal. This information should be included in the FEIS.</p>	<p>hydraulic conductivity of these units and due to the relatively flat gradients that can be expected based on pre-mine conditions.</p> <p>Further the quotes regarding no impact from past CCR placement within the Environmental Setting section have been revised to indicate that impacts are negligible. Those conclusions were based on CHIA criteria, which do not exactly match the NEPA criteria for impact levels defined in the EIS. The EIS analysis for potential impacts is negligible. Further text has been added to the EIS acknowledging that vertical fracture flow has been observed at other locations in the San Juan basin and this could be a potential weakness in the site-specific modeling conducted.</p> <p>The following text was added to the Final EIS: Available site specific data from within the immediate vicinity of the Project area, used for modeling conducted as part of the CHIA for the Navajo Mine, shows low hydraulic conductivity and does not suggest the presence of significant vertical fracture flow of groundwater between the PCS and Fruitland Formation (OSMRE 2012). However, vertical fracture flow has been observed at other areas in the San Juan Basin (Wilson 2012). The evidence of fracture flow at other locations within the San Juan Basin presents a modeling uncertainty as it presents the possibility that fracture flow may exist within the vicinity of the Project area.</p> <p>Surface water quality monitoring is conducted by NNEPA along the San Juan River both upstream and downstream of the Navajo Mine Lease area as presented on Figure 4.5-5. OSMRE conducted an evaluation of the potential impacts of past placement of CCR at the Navajo Mine on groundwater and surface water. The evaluation incorporated water quality data collected by the Navajo Nation on the San Juan River as well as groundwater quality data at the mine. The evaluation found that there is a potential groundwater discharge from the historical mining operation to the San Juan River; however the groundwater discharge rates were minimal as compared to the volume of surface water in the San Juan River and no adverse water quality effects were observed. As such, OSMRE does not see a need for additional monitoring of the San Juan River for that purpose. Navajo Nation conducts its own monitoring of the San Juan River in accordance with their responsibility to ensure the designated uses are met. Whether or not the results of Navajo Nation monitoring are publicly available is at the discretion of Navajo Nation EPA.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
243.006	Ms.	Kathleen	Martyn Goforth	EPA, Region IX	6/26/2014	<p>Monitoring for CCR contamination from Four Corners Power Plant</p> <p>The DEIS reports two areas of groundwater seepage at the existing Dry Fly Ash Disposal Areas (DFADAs) known as the “north seep” and “south seepage area”, which have contaminated groundwater (p. 4.5-57). According to the DEIS, APS has installed extraction wells and constructed the north intercept trench to collect seepage and prevent contamination of the Chaco River, and is currently constructing a south intercept trench to remediate groundwater to protect the river. The DEIS does not indicate how the groundwater is being remediated. With this action and the monitoring of the existing trenches, the DEIS concludes that continued operation and expansion of the DFADAs would have less potential to contaminate local groundwater and water quality in Chaco Wash (p. 4.5-57). We believe that such actions to capture and treat contaminated groundwater are necessary to ensure that the continued operation and expansion of the DFADAs does not contribute significantly to the existing pollutant load in the Chaco River. The operation of the intercept trenches, as well as the monitoring of groundwater in existing and, possibly, new monitoring wells, is critical to ensuring that any pollutant sources present in ground water that re-surfaces via seeps can be traced so that appropriate corrective actions can be undertaken.</p> <p>Recommendation: We recommend that any FCPP lease renewal by the BIA include conditions requiring the continued monitoring and remediation of groundwater at the DFADAs. We also recommend that the FEIS identify the method of groundwater remediation that is occurring or will occur.</p>	<p>The Final CCR rule published on December 19 includes groundwater monitoring and reporting requirements as well as remediation for any impacts observed above certain levels. The rule is “self-implementing” and submittal of reports to the appropriate tribal agency and posting online is required. In addition, the rule applies to both existing and new CCR areas. Therefore, no additional mitigation measures or conditions regarding groundwater monitoring or remediation is necessary.</p> <p>The term “remediate” has been deleted. No active remediation in the sense of treatment occurs. Water is hydraulically controlled through extraction wells and trenches to prevent seepage into groundwater or Chaco River and is pumped into the Lined Decant Water Pond for either reuse in the power plant or evaporation.</p>
243.007	Ms.	Kathleen	Martyn Goforth	EPA, Region IX	6/26/2014	<p>Dam Safety</p> <p>We appreciate the information in the DEIS that states that all recommendations from the 2009 Coal Ash Impoundment – Site Specific Assessment Report for the FCPP were completed in 2009 (p. 4.14-4). On p. 4.15-22, however, the DEIS states that APS indicated that the suggested items would be addressed and completed prior to the end of 2009. The DEIS specifically identifies some of the recommendations, but does not indicate whether the following are occurring: (From section 12.4 of the recommendations):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue monitoring seepage at the downstream toe of the south embankment (Pond #4 toe) for any changes in seepage quantity and flow rate or evidence that the flow is carrying soil/ash particles from the embankment</li> <li>• Expand program to include additional monitoring of potential seepage under the dam at the northwest corner of the LAI, where the LAI embankment was not tied-in to the underlying Pond 3-4 embankment to provide continuity of seepage control, and where a potential seepage pathway exists if the HDPE lining fails. Install additional piezometers to address this potential seepage pathway and expand</li> </ul>	<p>As stated on page 4.15-22, in response to the recommendations from the 2009 coal ash impoundment, “minor maintenance items were identified and APS followed up with a written response and action plan, indicating the suggested items would be addressed and completed prior to the end of 2009 (APS 2009).”</p> <p>The text has been revised to provide the following updates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The recommendation to continue monitoring seepage at the downstream toe of the south embankment (Pond #4 toe) for any changes in seepage quantity and flow rate or evidence that the flow is carrying soil/ash particles from the embankment is being met. A seepage collection toe drain was installed in this area. Flow from the toe drain is negligible.</li> <li>• The recommendation to expand the monitoring program to include additional monitoring of potential seepage under the dam at the northwest corner of the LAI, where the LAI embankment was not tied-in to the underlying Pond 3-4 embankment to provide continuity of seepage control, and where a potential seepage pathway exists if the HDPE lining fails is being met.</li> </ul>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p>documentation in APS dam safety inspections to note any evidence of seepage near the downstream toe of the dam in this area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Repair or replace the two settlement plates that do not appear to be providing useful information and that may have been damaged during construction or maintenance activities.</li> </ul> <p>Recommendation: For clarity in the FEIS, indicate whether the above recommended actions and monitoring from the 2009 Coal Ash Impoundment – Site Specific Assessment Report for the FCPP are occurring. If the requested monitoring has occurred, include results of seepage monitoring efforts.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The recommendation to install additional piezometers to address this potential seepage pathway and expand documentation in APS dam safety inspections to note any evidence of seepage near the downstream toe of the dam in this area has been met. APS installed three piezometers in the recommended area. Levels in these piezometers are recorded quarterly.</li> <li>The recommendation to repair or replace the two settlement plates that do not appear to be providing useful information and that may have been damaged during construction or maintenance activities was met.</li> <li>Attempts were made to reinitiate the vibrating wire settlement plates but were unsuccessful, so settlement rods were installed as a replacement. Four settlement rods (mechanical) were installed to replace the malfunctioning vibrating wire settlement plates.</li> </ul>
243.008	Ms.	Kathleen	Martyn Goforth	EPA, Region IX	6/26/2014	<p>Dust Control from CCR Management</p> <p>The DEIS provides information regarding the FCPP Dust Control Plan. The DEIS states that, “During placement of CCR, compaction control, added moisture, and slope control are used, as well as dust suppressant and periodic fabric covering of slopes”. The DEIS states that DFADA 1 and 2 will continue to be used until they reach capacity in 2016. DFADA 1 is tallest on the west berm, approximately 110 feet above natural grade (p. 4.15-12). The DEIS also states that APS would construct five additional DFADAs to accommodate future disposal of all fly ash, bottom ash, and flue gas desulfurization waste generated through the duration of the lease term. Each site is anticipated to be approximately 60 acres and approximately 120 feet high (p. xiii and p. 3-15). On page 4.15-27, the DEIS states that the new DFADA’s would be approximately 80 feet high, so it is not clear which height represents the height above natural grade. If the height of the DFADAs will be 120 feet above natural grade, to the extent there is any settlement in the down-wind directions, fugitive dust control on such a high active face would be difficult to maintain. EPA has received complaints from nearby residents regarding fugitive dust, therefore renewed efforts at dust control, and monitoring of dust control effectiveness, is essential.</p> <p>Recommendation: Clarify in the FEIS whether the height of the DFADAs will be 80 feet or 120 feet above natural grade. For either height, we recommend that the DFADAs be continuously sprayed with water to ensure dust is controlled. Slope control and the other dust control measures in the Dust Control Plan should be monitored regularly to ensure they are effective. When wind speeds are elevated, more frequent dust control should be implemented. We recommend that a dust complaint procedure and hotline be developed to allow local residents to report ineffective dust control conditions. APS should conduct outreach to the local population, in Navajo as well as English, to ensure awareness of this complaint procedure.</p>	<p>The Final EIS text was changed to clarify the DFADAs are expected to be 120 feet above natural grade.</p> <p>Regarding the comment that dust control mitigation measures should be included in the Draft EIS, the “Approach to Environmental Analysis” section (Chapter 4) identifies that mitigations are recommended for unavoidable impacts that are major, as defined for each resource area. Because the air quality analysis identifies that PM levels are below the established NAAQS, impacts are not considered major.</p> <p>With regard to the specific recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continuous watering of DFADAs for dust control is not practical or desirable. The DFADAs are designed for dry disposal of ash. Continuously watering the DFADAs would create waste water that would have to be managed. As stated in Section 3.2.6.1 of the Draft EIS, water is introduced to the ash as it is loaded into the transport trucks for dust control and proper compaction in the DFADA. Inactive surfaces of the DFADAs are covered with fabric or sprayed with dust suppressants. Active work areas and roads are periodically sprayed with water for dust control. Watering of active work areas and roads is increased during high wind events.</li> <li>Further, as required in the FCPP Dust Control Plan, Plant personnel verifies and documents control measures monthly. Plant and contract personnel monitor dust control on a more frequent informal basis. Corrective actions are implemented as needed. Also, watering of active work areas and roads is increased during high wind events. EPA published its Final Rule for Hazardous and Solid Waste Management System; Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals from Electrical Utilities on December 19, 2014. The Final EIS has been updated accordingly to reflect this new rule and its applicability to the FCPP. A comprehensive discussion of the rule, its provisions, and enforceability is provided in Section 4.15, Hazardous Materials and Wastes. In addition, specific provisions of the rule that apply to other</li> </ul>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							resource areas (i.e., Water and Air) are included in Sections 4.1, 4.5, 4.11, 4.17, and 4.18.
243.009	Ms.	Kathleen	Martyn Goforth	EPA, Region IX	6/26/2014	<p><b>Cumulative Health Impacts</b></p> <p>The EIS should acknowledge the cumulative health impacts that the residents in the vicinity of the project experience. The DEIS largely relies on the air quality analysis conclusions for its public health impact assessment. The DEIS states that the combined impacts to air quality from the Navajo Mine and the Four Corners Power Plant (FCPP) are minor (p. 4.1-85) because modeled criteria pollutant emissions meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). EPA sets the NAAQS at a level requisite to protect public health with an adequate margin of safety, taking into consideration effects on susceptible populations, based on the scientific literature; however, as we previously commented, EPA's Particulate Matter and Ozone Integrated Science Assessments (U.S. EPA, 2009 and U.S. EPA, 2013) determined that there is no evidence of a population-level threshold in PM- and ozone-related health effects in the epidemiological literature. This means that there is not a level below which there is no impact. Instead, health impacts that occur below the standards are assumed to be more uncertain than those occurring above the standards.</p> <p>The DEIS acknowledges that the cumulative public health effects depend on the respiratory health status of residents in the area (p. 4.18-54), yet it does not appear that respiratory health was considered in the conclusions that project impacts to public health from the FCPP are negligible for criteria pollutants (p. xli, p. 4.17-22) and minor for hazardous air pollutants (p. p. 4.17-24), and that cumulative impacts to public health from both the FCPP and the Mine are minor (p. 4.18-54). The DEIS does disclose San Juan County's most recent Community Health Profile, which found that San Juan County has a higher incidence of chronic lower respiratory disease, comprised of chronic bronchitis, asthma, and emphysema, compared to New Mexico or the rest of the United States. It also cites a study by the New Mexico Department of Health that found that San Juan County residents are 34 percent more likely to have asthma-related medical visits after 20 parts per billion increases in local ozone levels (p. 4.17-4).</p> <p>A study by Bunnell, et al, also cited in the DEIS, documents disproportionately high rates of respiratory disease in the Indian Health Service's Shiprock Service area (p. 4.11-14). None of this information appears to have been factored into the DEIS' conclusions regarding cumulative public health impacts.</p> <p>The DEIS also discusses the unique situation of in-home coal burning from coal provided free of charge to Navajos who reside within a certain radius of the mine, which was part of the original mining lease agreement. The DEIS states that, from October through March, coal for personal use by project employees and local Chapter residents is placed in the Community Coal Stockpile, located adjacent to the Navajo Mine</p>	<p>The Draft EIS includes quantitative analysis of the cumulative health impacts to residents in the vicinity of the Project. With respect to the use of NAAQS as significance criteria, the Draft EIS included a specific human health risk assessment that considered the specific composition of coal dust at the Navajo Mine, and evaluated whether the NAAQS were protective of susceptible populations. As such, under the site specific conditions, the NAAQS are protective of public health.</p> <p>Section 4.17 considers project-specific impacts, and the findings (negligible to minor) reflect the specific analyses and modeling (air quality, human health, ecological analyses). The comment notes that the Draft EIS appropriately considered cumulative impacts by citing additional studies (New Mexico Department of Health, Bunnell et al.) that address past and current public health issues. The cumulative impact analysis has been modified as follows to include these studies, which were only mentioned in Section 4.17:</p> <p>“The cumulative public health effects also depend on the ambient air quality in the San Juan Air Basin and the respiratory health status of residents in the area. San Juan County's most recent Community Health Profile includes a comprehensive overview of health indicators including respiratory health (San Juan County 2010). This study found that San Juan County has a higher incidence of chronic lower respiratory disease (CLRD) comprised of chronic bronchitis, asthma, and emphysema compared to New Mexico or the rest of the United States. Another study found that elevated levels of ozone in San Juan County were linked to incidence of asthma-related medical visits. This study found that San Juan County residents are 34 percent more likely to have asthma-related medical visits after 20 parts per billion increases in local ozone levels (NMDH 2007). Another study also conducted in the Project Area, was undertaken to better understand the relationship between the perceived risk to respiratory health from ambient air quality and the risk presented by coal combustion inside of dwellings for cooking and heating. The study considered special exposures for vulnerable populations, and examined the relationship between coal combustion in homes in the Shiprock area (Shiprock residents have easy access to the low or no-cost coal, which is made available to Navajo tribal members near Navajo Mine and impacts on respiratory health. The conclusion of the report states that the presence of two large coal-fired power plants near Shiprock may contribute to that risk, but results from this study suggest that the risk could be reduced by making relatively simple and inexpensive changes to methods of home heating” (Bunnell et al. 2010). In their comments to the Draft EIS, EPA recommended consideration of funding for replacement of old stoves with more efficient stoves appropriate for the fuel types being used; funding for replacement of old coal and wood stoves with propane gas heaters; assistance to the affected community for residential solar, wind or other electrical generation</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p>Area III office (p. 2-12). Because many Navajo are able to obtain cheap or free coal, and they do not have access, or affordable access, to electricity – an existing environmental justice vulnerability -- many use coal to heat their homes. It is not unusual for the coal to be burned in stoves that were not designed to burn coal, nor is it unusual that the stoves are poorly maintained or improperly vented. The Bunnell study revealed that air quality from coal combustion inside dwellings used for cooking and heating had an average 24-hour wintertime PM2.5 level exceeding EPA’s ambient air standard for PM2.5 (note that EPA does not regulate indoor air pollution levels). This cumulative impact, which directly relates to the mine operations for which this EIS is being prepared, should be considered in the cumulative public health impact conclusions, as well as referenced in the environmental justice impact conclusions.</p> <p>Recommendation: We recommend that the cumulative public health impact assessment conclusions factor in the respiratory health status of residents in the area, as the DEIS states should occur on page 4.18-54. The FEIS should document how the lack of access to electric power and the provision of free or low-cost coal by the project have contributed to indoor air quality cumulative impacts, as well as outdoor air pollution during stagnant winter weather conditions. Because the DEIS does not define what would constitute a moderate or major impact to cumulative public health and does not define a level of significance, we recommend identifying mitigation measures for this impact, since the existing public health environment is severely compromised (health outcomes for Navajo are worse than for the general population in San Juan County; life expectancy is lower, mortality rates far exceed the national rates; investment in healthcare services on Navajo land is about half of that for the general population; and healthcare disparities between Navajo and the general population are pronounced due to lack of access and funding - p. 4.10-15). The DEIS notes that the results from the Bunnell study suggest that the added risk from in-home coal burning could be reduced by making relatively simple and inexpensive changes to methods of home heating (p. 4.17-4). Such changes should be further discussed and identified as possible mitigation for this cumulative public health and environmental justice impact.</p> <p>EPA previously recommended mitigation for cumulative impacts from in-home coal combustion supplied by the continued operation of the mine. At a minimum, the following potential mitigation measures should be identified and considered: funding for replacement of old stoves with more efficient stoves appropriate for the fuel types being used; funding for replacement of old coal and wood stoves with propane gas heaters; assistance to the affected community for residential solar, wind or other electrical generation projects; assistance to Navajo Tribal Utility Authority for local electricity connections and subsidies to any affected residents; and education on how to properly operate, vent, and maintain existing stoves, perhaps locating this information in Navajo at the Community Coal Stockpile or producing an instructional video to play in</p>	<p>projects; assistance to Navajo Tribal Utility Authority for local electricity connections and subsidies to any affected residents; and education on how to properly operate, vent, and maintain existing stoves, perhaps locating this information in Navajo at the Community Coal Stockpile or producing an instructional video to play in Indian Health Service clinic waiting rooms. As noted below, several of these measures are in place.</p> <p>The reports summarized in Section 4.17 of the EIS and cited in the EPA comment letter do not document an existing major impact, and as such the cumulative impacts due to the existing condition plus continued emissions from FCPP would not be major. We would also indicate that, while public health impacts of the Proposed Action alone are negligible for criteria pollutants and minor for HAPs, the cumulative impacts on an already compromised population would be greater than minor because they add to an existing impaired community’s health burden, thus the cumulative impact determination has been changed from minor to “minor to moderate.” EPA’s discussion of mitigation focuses on the effect of the Navajo Mine Community Coal Stockpile. The implication is that this stockpile is the primary, or only, source of coal used for indoor coal burning. However, it is a relatively minor source; there are other local areas of community harvesting of coal for home use, and coal collection occurs from these areas. Coal is also sold for the purpose of indoor burning. We are not sure that EPA is aware of the pervasive presence of coal and its use for home burning in this area. Even removing the Navajo Mine Community Coal Stockpile altogether would not have an effect on indoor burning of coal, except to make it more difficult to obtain for mine workers. Further inquiry with MMCo and NTEC indicates that, for the community coal stockpile at Navajo Mine, there is a permit system that limits the use and transport of coal. In addition, representatives from local chapter houses receive training on the safe use and transport of coal, and these representatives are expected to inform the community. For the past 3 years, Navajo Mine has provided safety and health awareness training to Chapters that participate in the coal distribution program. Chapter coordinators are required to give the training to all Chapter members who request a coal permit. Additionally, Indian Health Services provides radio public service announcements on coal dump rules, preparedness, and safety guidelines throughout the winter season. NTEC plans to continue this educational program in coordination with Indian Health Services and is committed to improving the training to specifically require that coal permittees certify that they have attended the safety and health training on an annual basis before obtaining their annual coal permit. Indian Health Services also has training videos that inform the local population on the safe home use of coal.</p> <p>The cumulative impacts chapter will be augmented to identify specific activities related to public health protection related to in-home coal burning that are already being conducted by the project Applicants, the Navajo Nation, and Indian Health Services.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						Indian Health Service clinic waiting rooms. Selection of any of the above measures should be done in consultation with the affected residents.	<p>Need for Mitigation</p> <p>The impact is moderate, and does not require mitigation beyond what is already being conducted by the project Applicants, the Navajo Nation, and Indian Health Services. Furthermore, CEQ's January 14, 2011 guidance for mitigation states: "CEQ also acknowledges that NEPA does not create a general substantive duty on federal agencies to mitigate adverse environmental effects". This is particularly the case in the preparation of an EIS. The CEQs "40 Most Asked Questions" states:</p> <p>"All relevant, reasonable mitigation measures that could improve the project are to be identified, even if they are outside the jurisdiction of the lead agency or the cooperating agencies, and thus would not be committed as part of the RODs of these agencies. Sections 1502.16(h), 1505.2(c). This will serve to [46 FR 18032] alert agencies or officials who can implement these extra measures, and will encourage them to do so. Because the EIS is the most comprehensive environmental document, it is an ideal vehicle in which to lay out not only the full range of environmental impacts but also the full spectrum of appropriate mitigation. However, to ensure that environmental effects of a proposed action are fairly assessed, the probability of the mitigation measures being implemented must also be discussed. Thus the EIS and the Record of Decision should indicate the likelihood that such measures will be adopted or enforced by the responsible agencies. Sections 1502.16(h), 1505.2. If there is a history of nonenforcement or opposition to such measures, the EIS and Record of Decision should acknowledge such opposition or nonenforcement. If the necessary mitigation measures will not be ready for a long period of time, this fact, of course, should also be recognized."</p> <p>The following text has been added to the conclusion of 4.18.</p> <p>While the public health impacts of the Proposed Action alone are negligible for criteria pollutants and minor for HAPs, the cumulative impacts on an already compromised population are minor to moderate. The primary impairment to public health is the indoor burning of coal. Although the Navajo Mine Community Coal Stockpile does provide coal to mine employees, it is a relatively minor source; other local sources of community collecting of coal for home use are readily available. Coal from non-project sources is also sold for the purpose of indoor burning.</p> <p>The use of the community coal stockpile at Navajo Mine requires a permit administered by the companies that limits the use and transport of coal. In addition, representatives from local chapter houses receive training on the safe transport of coal, and these representatives are expected to inform the community. Indian Health Services also has training videos that inform the local population on the safe home use of coal. Because the cumulative public health impact is minor to moderate, and the contribution of the Proposed Action to that condition is negligible to minor, no further mitigation is required beyond the ongoing</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							<p>permit/training program, and IHS' public education program on safe indoor burning of coal.</p> <p>There is a permit system that limits the use and transport of coal from the community coal stockpile at Navajo Mine. In addition, representatives from local chapter houses receive training on the safe use and transport of coal, and these representatives are expected to inform the community. This training is conducted with participation of Northern Navajo Medical Center, Indian Health Services, and includes a video produced by Four Directions, Office of Environmental Health that informs the participants on the safe home use of coal.</p>
243.010	Ms.	Kathleen	Martyn Goforth	EPA, Region IX	6/26/2014	<p>Excluding Fugitive Dust from the Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA)</p> <p>EPA previously commented that fugitive dust should have been included in the Human Health Risk Assessment and that uncertainty regarding the assumption of equal toxicity of PM species does not warrant the exclusion of fugitive dust from the impacts analysis (on the basis of having a lower proportion of metals and other toxic substances). OSM has chosen, instead, to include a discussion of potential impacts from PM2.5, including baseline and projected future emissions.</p> <p>Recommendation: We recommend that the FEIS clearly state that fugitive dust was not included in the HHRA.</p>	<p>Fugitive dust emissions were quantified and presented in the air quality section and compared to the relevant regulatory standards (PM10 and PM2.5). Based on comments to the Administrative Draft EIS, OSMRE responded to the lack of site-specific fugitive dust analysis in the HHRA by conducting additional analysis in the Draft EIS specifically focused on assessing health effects associated with PM10, PM2.5, diesel particulate matter, and also exposure to coal constituents in coal dusts at PM2.5 levels. Fugitive dust emission risk assessment was conducted, and focused on coal dust constituents based on data from the mine. In addition, the mine has an on-going fugitive dust monitoring program, with triggers for further action.</p>
243.011	Ms.	Kathleen	Martyn Goforth	EPA, Region IX	6/26/2014	<p>Potential for Mine Methane Capture</p> <p>The DEIS quantifies the fugitive methane emissions that would be liberated from coal seams during mining (p. 4.2-22). Methane has a global warming potential more than 20 times higher than CO2 for a 100-year period. Methane can be captured at surface mines through pre-mine drainage, either from the surface or through horizontal boreholes. EPA is aware that there are surface mines in operation in the Powder River Basin in Wyoming and elsewhere around the world that are recovering methane through pre-mine drainage and, thus, mitigating the impact from this powerful greenhouse gas. Also note that surface mine methane capture is now eligible for carbon credits - a market tracking system that supports the implementation of California's Cap-and-Trade Program - for greenhouse gas emission reductions associated with the capture and destruction of methane in the U.S. that would otherwise be vented into the atmosphere as a result of mining operations at active underground and surface coal mines. See: <a href="http://www.arb.ca.gov/newsrel/newsrelease.php?id=602">http://www.arb.ca.gov/newsrel/newsrelease.php?id=602</a>. In addition, the DEIS states that BIA is currently evaluating, under NEPA, Western Oil &amp; Gas's proposal to develop 600 natural gas wells in the Burnham, Upper Fruitland, and Nenahnezad/San Juan Chapters, which would involve the installation of new pipeline (p. 4.18-13). Recommendation: We recommend that the FEIS discuss the feasibility of capturing methane from Navajo Mine. Include the economic benefits that could occur from selling the carbon credits in California's Cap-and-Trade Program, as well</p>	<p>Project-related GHG emissions were quantified and fugitive methane from mining was determined not to be a significant source of CO2e emissions from the project. When a proposed federal action meets an applicable threshold for quantification and reporting, CEQ proposes that the agency should consider mitigation measures to reduce GHG emissions, subject to reasonable limits based on feasibility and practicality. The Navajo Mine proponents explored the feasibility of methane capture similar to the drilling processes used in commercial coalbed methane extraction. Methane in the Navajo Mine coal seams exists in a very low pressure environment, which would require the seams to be pressurized during the extraction process. Additionally no infrastructure, such as pipeline collection systems, is near enough to the mine to make collection and resale feasible. Therefore, due to low pressure in the coal seams and lack of infrastructure to bring captured methane to market, mine methane capture was determined to be infeasible. The EIS was modified to include a discussion on the infeasibility of mine methane capture.</p> <p>Regarding the comment on regional GHG cumulative impacts, Section 4.18, Cumulative Effects, addresses oil and gas contributions to regional CO2e emissions along with the other projects identified in the region. The conclusion in this section is that: "Mobile source emissions from the Navajo Mine SMCRA Permit area and Pinabete SMCRA Permit Area although quantifiable, are relatively small compared to future power plant emissions; therefore, this discussion focuses on the contribution of</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p>as the possible interconnection or use of natural gas infrastructure nearby from Western Oil &amp; Gas's proposed natural gas wells. Additional information regarding methane recovery at surface mines is available in the following EPA documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Case Study – Methane Recovery at Surface Mines" - <a href="http://epa.gov/coalbed/docs/CMOP-Methane-Recovery-Surface-Mines-March-2014.pdf">http://epa.gov/coalbed/docs/CMOP-Methane-Recovery-Surface-Mines-March-2014.pdf</a></li> <li>• "US Surface Coal Mine Methane Recovery Opportunities" - <a href="http://epa.gov/coalbed/docs/cmm_recovery_opps_surface.pdf">http://epa.gov/coalbed/docs/cmm_recovery_opps_surface.pdf</a></li> </ul>	<p>FCPP to regional climate change impacts. While all projects in Table 4.18-1 would contribute some GHG emissions, the major producers of GHG emissions within this study area are the 17 power plants..." Therefore, the mine methane capture would not address the sources of cumulative impacts.</p>
243.012	Ms.	Kathleen	Martyn Goforth	EPA, Region IX	6/26/2014	<p><b>Petroleum Contamination</b></p> <p>The DEIS states that "Secondary containment is not provided for mobile refueling vehicles in areas where NTEC staff are present, and the maximum amount of time before a discharge would be detected is less than 24 hours" (p. 4.15-6). It is unclear why it could take hours before a discharge from mobile refueling is detected. The DEIS states that the bioremediation of petroleum-contaminated soils takes place on-site (p. 4.15-6). The source of this contaminated soil is not identified.</p> <p>Recommendation: The FEIS should identify the source of the petroleum-contaminated soils and indicate whether they are originating from mobile refueling operations. We recommend that the applicant review and, as needed, update its Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure (SPCC) Plan to identify applicable general containment or drainage control measures, as required by 40 CFR 112.7(c) for mobile refuelers and mobile refueling, to ensure that releases associated with these operations are detected as soon as possible. For the continued operation of the FCPP and Navajo Mine, we recommend that additional measures be explored to prevent and contain releases when mobile refuelers may be unattended and during mobile refueling operations.</p>	<p>The material placed in the bioremediation areas includes Area III washbay water and sludge, and when necessary, any small volumes of petroleum contaminated soils, which result from minor accidental spills and leaks. The NTEC SPCC Plan meets the requirements of 40 CFR 112.7c, and any revisions or updates to the SPCC Plan to incorporate additional measures are considered part of the Proposed Action, as provided in Section 3.2.6 of the Draft EIS.</p>
243.013	Ms.	Kathleen	Martyn Goforth	EPA, Region IX	6/26/2014	<p>Table 4.1-28 on p. 4.1-67 is confusing. The second column is labeled "Estimated Post-2014 Baseline Emissions", but it is not clear what is meant by post-2014 emissions. The text says that the reductions in the third column represent the reductions from fully implementing BART, but our estimate for mercury reductions under BART implementation is 61%, not the 81% listed. It is possible that the table is intended to represent the additional reductions in mercury that could occur from implementation of the mercury and air toxics standards (MATS). If so, this should be clarified in the FEIS and a definition of "Post-2014 Baseline Emissions" should be provided.</p>	<p>"Estimated Post-2014 Baseline Emissions" was changed to "Estimated Post-2018 Baseline Emissions" and "Post-2014 versus Pre-2014 Baseline Reduction" was changed to "Post-2018 versus Pre-2014 Baseline Reduction". The sentence preceding Table 4.1-28: "Once BART is fully implemented, the reduction in air emissions from FCPP would decrease substantially." was changed to: "Once BART and mercury and air toxics standards (MATS) are fully implemented after 2018 (i.e., post-2018 emissions from Units 4 and 5), the reduction in air emissions from FCPP would decrease substantially."</p>
243.014	Ms.	Kathleen	Martyn Goforth	EPA, Region IX	6/26/2014	<p>In Table 4.5-6 on page 4.5-20, the result for mercury is listed as &gt;0.001. Should this have been &lt;0.001?</p>	<p>The text in Table 4.5-6 (Table 4.5-7 in the Final EIS) has been revised to indicate the concentration of mercury detected was less than 0.001.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
243.015	Ms.	Kathleen	Martyn Goforth	EPA, Region IX	6/26/2014	In the Hazardous and Solid Waste chapter, the PDEIS states that “specific study of the disposal of CCR in Navajo Mine has not identified adverse effects” (p. 4.15-5). This does not appear to be supported, given the contamination identified in the Water Resources chapter. Groundwater contamination is an adverse effect.	Page 4.5-44 of the Draft EIS states that impacts to groundwater from historic placement of CCR are negligible. This corresponds with the statement in Section 4.15. No change made to Draft EIS.
244.001	Mr.	Arnold	Yazzie, D., Sr.		05/06/14	The positive direct and indirect impact not only benefit Farmington but all Diné community within San Juan County and surrounding counties and states of Colorado, Arizona and Utah. The impact to small businesses will continue to be realized.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
245.001	Mr.	Jerald	Estes		06/02/14	I believe the EIS should be approved because it provides stability to the Four corners region and the Navajo Nation as a whole. Personally if the EIS is not approved, I would not only lose my job, but it will hurt the Four corners region and the Navajo Nation economically.	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS and will notify the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in spring 2015.
246.001	Mr.	Lenard	Cambridge		05/20/14	No Substantive Comment	Thank you for your comment.
247.001	Mr.	Norman	Benally		05/20/14	No Substantive Comment	Thank you for your comment
248.001	Ms.	Nancy	Todea, D.	Navajo Nation	05/21/14	No Substantive Comment	Thank you for your comment
249.001	Mr.	Raymond	Sanchez, T.	APS	Not Available	The coal plants are a great asset to this country, providing clean, <u>RELIABLE</u> , cost affordable power, and jobs.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
250.001	Ms.	Renetta	Scacchitti		Not Available	In addition, the safe & continuous operations of both mine & plant provide a good economic base for the region. The companies contribute a lot to the community in addition to providing jobs (i.e., the Future Energy Center near the San Juan college).	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
251.001	Ms.	Theresa	Yazzie	4-Corners Salon	05/06/14	I recommend the mine to remain open because we the people, our children need to have jobs. The whole reservtion needs this Power Plant to continued to exist.	OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.
252.001	Mr.	William	Karls		Not Available	No Substantive Comment	Thank you for your comment.
253.001	Ms.	Judith	Williams	League of Women Voters of New Mexico	06/16/14	Instead of allowing the expansion of coal mining operations, we encourage you to assist the Navajo nation in developing renewable sources of energy on their land.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives.
253.002	Ms.	Judith	Williams	League of Women Voters of New Mexico	06/16/14	We regret that the draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is not currently available for viewing. Your May 16, 2014, letter extending the comment deadline contains a link to the Document Library, but the link on that page is not live. We hope you will act quickly to rectify this problem.	OSMRE has confirmed that the web address provided in the letters is correct and functioning properly.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
254.001	Ms.	Caroline	Lippincott		Not Available	Consider the future of our existence on this planet and help with the transition into clean energy for the good of us all.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives.
255.001	Ms.	Irene	Hamilton		05/07/14	My primary concern with the mine and power plant has always been the erosion of air quality by airborne pollutants. I know that mercury is present in the fall out and that it is a neuro-toxin. Do we allow the continued genetic pollution of the Navajo people by continuing the operation of coal powered power plants?	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015. Section 4.1 of the Draft EIS addresses air quality. With regard to health and safety, Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS addresses potential impacts with regard to Health and Safety, including worker safety. Pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarize the human health risk assessment conducted for the project.
255.002	Ms.	Irene	Hamilton		05/07/14	Furthermore, did the EIS use NOAA data to profile the impact of wind occurrences and its effect on coal ash deposition?	To facilitate modeling, wind events were evaluated by reviewing on-site wind speed data correlated to threshold friction velocity guidance and emission estimation techniques published by the EPA.
256.001	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		1. The draft EIS should consistently recognize that the transmission lines and FCPP switchyard are not dependent upon the FCPP for their utility. The FCPP switchyard and associated transmission lines serve as a generation and transmission hub that enables efficient use and reliable transmission of existing generation resources. These resources include, in addition to FCPP-generated power, power generated from hydroelectric, renewable resources, nuclear, and other fossil fuels. The operation of the transmission lines also facilitates electric grid reliability in the western U.S. and region-wide reserve sharing agreements necessary to respond to system emergencies. Many references in the draft EIS recognize this utility for the switchyard and lines (seep. v, #3 ); however, some references state that these facilities are dependent upon the output of FCPP for continued operation. We recommend that the DEIS consistently treat the switchyard and transmission lines as having independent utility from the continued operation of the FCPP.	The description of the No Action alternative has been revised in Chapter 3 (Section 3.2.5.3) to indicate that: "The transmission lines and FCPP switchyard are not dependent upon the FCPP for their utility, as they also serve as a transmission hub for other existing generation sources."
256.002	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM	06/19/14	2. Alternative E for the transmission lines, No Action, should reflect consistent recognition of the utility of the transmission lines to electric grid reliability. We recommend carrying the language from page 4.9-25 through other applicable sections in the document.  "It is unlikely that they would be decommissioned and demolished however, because they still support interconnection of the Western US energy grid and potential future energy supplies could use the excess capacity."  If the lines were decommissioned, it is likely additional transmission facilities would have to be built to offset the lost capacity.	The suggested text has been added where applicable in the EIS: "It is unlikely that they would be decommissioned and demolished; however, because they still support interconnection of the Western U.S. energy grid and potential future energy supplies could use the excess capacity."

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
256.003	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		<p>1. Global - • The following land ownership/jurisdictions are not consistently referenced or recognized for PNM’s FW line (Four Corners to West Mesa).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Navajo Nation Trust and Allotted lands (We recommend correcting the multiple references that refer to only Trust lands.)</li> <li>• BLM</li> <li>• Zia Pueblo</li> <li>• New Mexico State Land Office</li> <li>• Bernalillo County</li> <li>• The NM State Land Office lands are not consistently identified for the FC line (Four Corners to San Juan Switchyard).</li> </ul>	<p>Section 1.2 has been amended to include the following clarification: The West Mesa transmission line traverses Navajo Nation tribal trust lands up until the Reservation boundary and then passes through private and allotted trust lands held in trust by the U.S. Federal Government for individual Navajo tribal members.</p> <p>Sections 4.9.2.1 and 4.12.2.2 have been amended similarly to clarify that the PNM 345kV West Mesa transmission line also crosses allotted lands that are held in trust by the U.S. Federal Government on behalf of individual Navajo members. Figure 4.9-2 (land use/ownership jurisdictions) has also been updated to show allotted lands.</p> <p>References referring to PNM’s “Four Corners to West Mesa” and “Four Corners to San Juan Switchyard” have been corrected throughout the Draft EIS. OSMRE contends that all other references to the other land assignments are consistently and appropriately used.</p>
256.004	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		<p>2. ES, pg iv, para 2 - Change “Six transmission lines...” to “Eight...” There are several different references to the number of transmission lines throughout the document. We suggest using one number which reflects that the APS line to Cholla has two parallel lines. See p. 2-21 paragraph 1.</p>	<p>The number of transmission lines has been changed to “eight” in the Executive Summary and Section 1.1.3. Section 2.2 correctly referred to “eight” in the Draft EIS.</p>
256.005	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		<p>3. ES, pg iv, para 4 - Change “Two modifications to these transmission lines...” to “Two previous actions on these...” Existing wording implies a physical modification to the lines.</p>	<p>Changes made per comments received.</p>
256.006	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		<p>4. ES, pg vi, para 7 - Under NPS, remove “review ROW renewal for PNM FCPP to West Mesa transmission line.” This is a perpetual easement.</p>	<p>Changes made per comments received.</p>
256.007	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		<p>5. Table ES-2, pg vi - Zia Pueblo is not listed as a consulting party for Sec 106.</p>	<p>Zia Pueblo has been provided with all the information that consulting parties received, and OSMRE has consulted with the Zia Pueblo THPO throughout the Section 106 process. They are an invited signatory to the PA. Please see Section 5.1.3.2 of the DEIS for greater detail.</p>
256.008	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		<p>6. ES, pg vii, para 1 - Add text in bold: “BIA would approve the lease agreement for the FCPP and transmission lines, and BLM...”</p>	<p>Change made</p>
256.009	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		<p>7. ES, pg xii, para 5 - Change “other generators” to “enable efficient use and reliable transmission of other generation resources”.</p>	<p>No change made.</p>
256.010	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		<p>8. ES, pg xiv, para 3, #1. In 3 - Suggest including that the BLM ROW expires in May 2016. A portion of the line conveyed by BLM to Zia Pueblo expires in May 2016 and requires BIA approval.</p>	<p>No change made.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
256.011	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		9. ES, pg xiv, Last para - • Change “The Navajo Lease for the 4.5-mile portion...” to “The Navajo Lease for the 6.03 mile...”  • Add text in bold: “...between FCPP and the PNM San Juan Generating Station <b>Switchyard.</b> ”	Changes made
256.012	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		10. Table ES-11, pg xxi, Row 4 - Add text in bold to reference the cultural resources programmatic agreement (PA) for FCPP and transmission lines. “ <b>Specific protection measures listed in the PA for FCPP and transmission lines. Internal evaluation to ensure cultural property protection. Avoidance or monitoring for ground-disturbing activities in the vicinity of eligible or unevaluated sites. If the internal evaluation process indicates that NRHP-eligible will not be avoided, the BIA, in consultation with the appropriate agency, will develop a Treatment Plan to resolve adverse effects in accordance with the final PA.</b> ”	Change made
256.013	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		11. Table ES-11 pg xxii, Row 1 - Delete strikethrough and add text in bold. “...PNM <del>will implement</del> an Avian Protection Program” to “...PNM <b>has</b> an Avian Protection Program.”	Changed to “will continue to implement...”
256.014	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		12. ES, pg xxii, para 1 - Wildlife and Habitats row. These are construction specifications from Desert Rock and are not appropriate for maintenance activities.	The Final EIS has been revised to be consistent with the BA.
256.015	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		13. ES, pg xxii, para 2, last line - Add text in bold. “...milkvetch and <b>Mesa Verde cactus.</b> ”	Change made
256.016	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		14. ES, pg xviii, para 1 - Terms are well-defined in Section 4.4 but the distinction between historic archaeological resources (i.e. sites) and historic resources (i.e. buildings, structures, objects, and districts) would benefit from clarification. Consider substituting “historic buildings and structures” for historic resources throughout the document to make this more understandable. As there are only 3 of these resources along the transmission lines, it might be useful to say what they are. Same comment applies to Section 4.4, pg 4.4-1, para 1.	Replaced the term “historic resources” with “ <u>historic buildings and structures</u> ”.
256.017	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		15. Table ES-12, pg xxxiv, Row 4 - Loss of revenue from transmission line ROW easement payments should be included under Alternative E.	Table ES-12 for Alternative E under the socioeconomic impacts has been revised to include “payments” in addition to tax revenues.
256.018	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		16. Table 1-1, pg 1-10, all para - Comments 4 and 5 carry over to this table.	Changes made per 256.006 & .007 above.
256.019	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		17. Sec 1.4, pg 1-10, Table last row - Change “...review ROW renewal for PNM FCPP to West Mesa Transmission line” to “...PNM ROW across NPS lands are perpetual.”	Change made per 256.006 above

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
256.020	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		18. Sec 1.4.2.6, pg 1-12, line 6 - Add text in bold: "...NHPA <b>and special status species under Section 7 of the ESA.</b> "	Change made
256.021	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		19. Sec 2.3.1, pg 2-31, para 3 - Suggest deleting references to PNM as this section is dedicated to APS and there is another ROW section for PNM on page 2-32.	Change made. Relevant text from the reference paragraph was added to page 2-32.
256.022	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		20. Sec 2.3.1, pg 2-31, para 3 - Add text in bold: "...neither APS nor PNM hold easements or access rights outside the transmission line ROW <b>but the right of ingress and egress is generally granted as a part of applicable ROW documents.</b> "	Change made
256.023	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		21. Sec 2.3.1, pg 2-31, para 3 - Delete the last sentence in the paragraph which states that "If access roads do not exist....." PNM generally relies upon existing roads and two-tracks to access transmission structures. Maintenance cannot be accomplished by crews on foot and PNM does not generally use helicopters for this purpose.	Change not made as text no longer references PNM
256.024	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		22. Sec 2.3.2, pg 2-33, para 3, ln 5 - Add text in bold. "...are consulted, as necessary,..."	Change not made
256.025	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		23. Sec 2.3.2, pg 2-32, para 3 - Add text in bold. "Power can flow in either direction <b>on the Four Corners-San Juan transmission line</b> depending on the demand and the generation availability. <b>Power flows on the Four Corners-West Mesa transmission line from north to south.</b> "	Change made
256.026	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		24. Sec 3.2.1.3, pg 3-19, para 1 - Suggest incorporating comment 8.	See response to Comment 256.010
256.027	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		25. Sec 3.2.1.3, pg 3-19, para 4 - See comment 10 for line length.	Change made per comment #256.011
256.028	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		26. Sec 3.2.5.3, pg 3-33, para 3 - Change "...not renew the 323 federal grants of ROW for PNM's Four Corners to Cholla..." to "not renew the 323 federal grants of ROW for PNM's Four Corners to San Juan..."	Change made
256.029	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		27. Sec 3.2.6.1, pg 3-35, para 1 - Add text in bold. "Vehicle access will be restricted to existing roads <b>and patrol trails</b> within the APS and PNM ROWs <b>to the extent possible.</b> "	Change made
256.030	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		28. Sec 3.2.6.1, pg 3-35, para 2 - Add text in bold. " <b>When access is not available through existing roads or patrol trails</b> , vehicles traveling offroad..."	Change made
256.031	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		29. Sec 3.2.6.4, pg 3-36, para 7 - Add text in bold to Transmission Line section in 3.2.6.4: " <b>Specific measures have been proposed and are included in the PA. Proponents rely upon review of end to end cultural surveys to determine if any cultural properties are located in the vicinity of proposed maintenance activities. Internal evaluation is</b>	Change made

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<b>conducted to ensure that cultural properties present along the line are not damaged by maintenance activities. If the internal evaluation process indicates that NRHP-eligible will not be avoided, the BIA, in consultation with the appropriate agency, will develop a Treatment Plan to resolve adverse effects.”</b>	
256.032	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		30. Sec 3.2.6.5, pg 3-38, para 7 - Add text in bold. “...staging areas... will be located in previously disturbed areas, <b>where possible</b> , but outside...”	Change made
256.033	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		31. Sec 3.2.6.5, pg 3-38, para 8 - Add text in bold. “...implemented as part of the construction process <b>as required by applicable regulations.</b> ”	Change made
256.034	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		32. Sec 3.2.6.5, pg 3-39, top - Add text in bold. “ <b>When required</b> , to protect the water quality...”	Change made
256.035	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		33. Sec 3.2.6.6, pg 3-40, para 3 - Add text in bold. “...harbor seeds prior to entering tribal <b>and federal</b> lands.”	Change made
256.036	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		34. Sec 3.2.6.7, pg 3-40-41 - As pointed out in BA comments, these are taken directly from Desert Rock and are applicable to construction but not maintenance. These need to be re-worked as requested in the BA.	Made consistent with the BA.
256.037	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		35. Sec 3.2.6.8, pg 3-44, para 5 - Add text in bold. “...milkvetch <b>and Mesa Verde cactus</b> “	Change made
256.038	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		36. Sec 3.4, pg 3-62, para 1 - OSMRE should be consulting with BLM and other applicable agencies as well as Navajo THPO and SHPO for determinations of project effect. This comment is common to all alternatives.	Changed sentence to read: “OSMRE is consulting with appropriate tribes and agencies for determination of Project effects.”
256.039	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		37. Sec 4.1, pg 4.1-2, para 1 - “...the EPA has proposed developing new secondary standards for SO2 and NOx aimed at reducing the impacts of atmospheric deposition on surface waters”	Change made
256.040	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		38. Sec 4.3.4.1, pg 4.3-23, para 1 - Delete: “ <del>All vehicle access to the transmission lines is via paved roadways.</del> ” Please refer to comments 21, 27, and 28 and the project description submitted by PNM.	Changed text as follows: Most vehicle access to the transmission lines is via paved roadways; however, some occurs on unpaved roadways. Implementation of applicant proposed measures would minimize any potential for impact; therefore, maintenance activities would not result in any erosion or soil disturbance.
256.041	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		39. Sec 4.4, pg 4.4-1, para 1 - Suggest incorporating comment 14.	See Response to comment 256.016
256.042	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		40. Sec 4.4.1.1, pg 4.4-1, para 6 - Add Tribal Historic Preservation Officers	The Draft EIS already says “federally recognized tribes”.
256.043	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		41. Sec 4.4.1.1, pg 4.4-2, para 2 - Remove Tribal Historic Preservation officer from line 2	Change made

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
256.044	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		42. Sec 4.4.1.1, pg 4.4-3, para 4 - ARPA permits are not issued for conducting surveys. ARPA permits are issued for mitigating adverse effects to archaeological resources through data recovery.	Revised 2nd sentence to read "ARPA requires Federal landowning agencies to issue ARPA permits to qualified individuals, institutions, or firms that conduct archaeological excavations within Federal and tribal lands.
256.045	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		43. Sec 4.4.2.1, pg 4.4-13, para 2 - Navajos constructed pueblitos during the Gobernador, not the Dinetah phase. Associated with the Pueblo Revolt and Reconquest.	The phase name was replaced with "Gobernador."
256.046	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		44. Sec 4.4.2.3, pg 4.4-16, para 1 - Sentence 3 may not be correct. No NRHP determinations are required for in-use areas according to Navajo Nation Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic, Modern & Contemporary Abandoned Sites.	Comment noted. Per NN Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic, Modern & Contemporary Abandoned Sites, in-use sites require only summary documentation, sufficient to determine if potential historic properties are present and if they would be affected by the proposed undertaking. This section has been updated following completion of consultation with the NNTHPO.
256.047	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		45. Sec 4.4.4.1, pg 4.4-21-24 - This table appears to consist exclusively of properties associated with the mine expansion and includes two of four sites along the FC line. It does not include properties associated with the power plant, the APS lines, or PNM's FW line. The table should be revised to incorporate the additional information.	Comment noted. Table includes only those resources that are historic properties and have been updated per the completion of Section 106 consultation.
256.048	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		46. Sec 4.4.4.1, pg 4.4-25, para 2 - Add text in bold "...resources that are determined eligible for the NRHP (Table 4.4-25). <b>The FCPP and transmission line PA is based on existing proponent conservation measures and includes provision for internal screening, site protection and treatment in cases where avoidance of adverse effect is not possible.</b> "	Comment noted. No change made as the other sections do not contain this language. The PAs are discussed previously on page 4.4-18 and later on page 4.4-35.
256.049	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		47. Sec 4.4.4.1, pg 4.4-25, para 2 - Table 4.4-5 does not contain the data to support the presence of 297 historic properties currently unevaluated and two archaeological resources that have been determined eligible within the APE. I would suggest expanding the data for completeness or deleting the table with reference to the appropriate appendices.	Comment noted. Table includes only those resources that are historic properties. All data are available in Appendix B. Tables have been updated based on completion of Section 106 Consultation.
256.050	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		48. Sec 4.5.4.1, pg 4.5-60, para 3 - Add text in bold to beginning of sentence. " <b>As appropriate,</b> ..." All maintenance activities that involve site disturbance do not warrant stormwater-related BMPs.	No change
256.051	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		49. Sec 4.5.4.1, pg 4.5-60, para 3, line 5 - Change "... required by the appropriate authorities..." to "...appropriate <b>permits</b> ..."	No change
256.052	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		50. Sec 4.5.4.5, pg 4.5-64, para 1 - Add text in bold. "...and obtain necessary permits, <b>which may include</b> a Stormwater General Permit..." As written, the sentence implies that such permit would be required; but, applicability will be a case by case assessment. This is the No Action Alternative for this section and should be edited in accordance with PNM's global comment regarding Alternative E.	Change made

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
256.053	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		51. Sec 4.6.4.1, pg 4.6-19, para 3 - Delete text in strikethrough and add text in bold. "Repair to transmission lines infrastructure is completed <del>regularly</del> <b>as needed.</b> "	Change made
256.054	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		52. Sec 4.6.4.1, pg 4.6-19, para 3 - Add text in bold. "... ground disturbing activities would be subject to agency consultation and permitting prior to construction <b>if sensitive resources which cannot be avoided are identified.</b> " Given that the ROW corridors have been previously disturbed and were recently surveyed for biological resources, it is not necessary or practical to require consultation for unqualified ground disturbing activities.	Change made
256.055	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		53. Sec 4.7.2., pg 4.7-26, para 7, line 4 - Also Bernalillo County as described in PNM Transmission Line FW Maintenance Biological Evaluation, Sandoval and Bernalillo Counties, New Mexico prepared by Marron and Associates in 2013. This BE covered the section of line from Rio Puerco to West Mesa.	Only portions of the PNM Rio Puerco to West Mesa line (previously authorized in a separate NEPA evaluation) occur in this county on private, state, and National Park Service lands in Bernalillo County. References to Bernalillo county have been added to the text where necessary. All federal (USFWS) and state species for Bernalillo County have been included in the revised section of 4.8 in the Draft EIS. BLM, Navajo, and Hopi species have been eliminated from consideration on this portion of the PNM transmission line.
256.056	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		54. Sec 4.8, pg 4.8-1 - Overall comment. This section should be updated with edits made previously to the draft BA.	The Final EIS has been made consistent with BA
256.057	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		55. Sec 4.8.2.1, pg 4.8-4, para 3 - Seven counties. Check and correct everywhere six counties are mentioned	The Final EIS has been made consistent with BA
256.058	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		56. Table 4.8-1, pg 4.8-7, para 1 - Yellow-billed cuckoo is Proposed Threatened	Table and text have been updated to reflect the proposed listing of Yellow-billed Cuckoo as threatened throughout the document.
256.059	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		57. Sec 4.9.2.1, pg 4.9-11, para 4 - • Change "This transmission line is approximately 135 miles..." to "... <b>156</b> miles..." • Replace "Rio Rancho" with " <b>Albuquerque.</b> "	See also page 1-4, 2-32 – have made consistent throughout document.
256.060	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		58. Sec 4.9.2.2, pg 4.9-15, para 2 - Delete text with strikethrough and add text in bold. "... access to the transmission line ROW is achieved <del>exclusively</del> through the use of public roads <b>and patrol trails</b> , neither APS nor PNM hold easements <del>or access rights</del> outside the transmission line ROW." Grant of easement documents allow ingress and egress to the ROW.	Change made
256.061	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		59. Sec 4.9.2.2, pg 4.9-15, para 2 - Remove "If access roads do not exist due to terrain constraints, maintenance crews use foot access or helicopters to access the transmission lines." This is not true for PNM crews.	Have clarified that PNM does not do this.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
256.062	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		60. Sec 4.10.2.2, pg 4.10-12, para 1 - The PNM and APS transmission and maintenance employees work out of Albuquerque and Phoenix, respectively, not the FCPP.	The intent of the following sentence is to take into account the large percentage of Navajo members that work at/around the FCPP, including transmission lines, as part of the project and likely have large amounts of support facilities and equipment stationed at FCPP: "All operations and maintenance employees for the APS and PNM transmission lines work out of the FCPP."
256.063	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		61. Sec 4.12.4.1, pg 4.12-10, para 2 - Delete strikethrough and add text in bold. "To protect the water quality of area surface waters during construction and maintenance activities, <del>any and all of the</del> BMPs required by <del>appropriate authorities</del> <b>permit conditions</b> will be implemented and maintained." The qualifier is unnecessary and can inadvertently impose BMPs that are not suited for a particular activity.	No change
256.064	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		62. Sec 4.17.2.3, pg 4.17-6, para 1 - Change "electromagnetic frequency (EMF)" to "electromagnetic <b>fields</b> (EMF)"	Change made
256.065	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		63. Sec 4.18.2, pg 4.18-3, Table 4.18-1 - Use the following text in column 2: "SJGS is operated by PNM and consists of four coal-fired, pressurized units that generate about 1,800 gross megawatts of electricity. The four units went online between 1973 and 1982, and is PNM's primary generation source, providing 32 percent of the power capacity to meet the needs of PNM customers.  SJGS is subject to the regional haze provisions of the Clean Air Act including a requirement to control visibility reducing pollutants using BART. In June 2011, the state of New Mexico submitted a Regional Haze SIP that included a SJGS BART determination. EPA partially approved and disapproved the SIP and issued a Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) requiring SJGS to install additional NOx control technology (SCR). The state of New Mexico and PNM challenged the FIP in court and began negotiations with EPA and NMED that resulted in a tentative agreement that lead to a Revised SIP. On April 30, 2014, EPA released a pre-publication version of a proposed approval of the Revised SIP that calls for installing selective non-catalytic reduction (SNCR) to reduce NOx on two units by 2016 and shutting down two units by the end of 2017.	Change made
256.066	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		64. Sec 4.18.2, pg 4.18-12, Row 2 - Change. " <del>APS</del> PNM operates the FC-Pillar..."	Change made
256.067	Ms.	Claudette	Horn	PNM		65. Table B-9, pg B-41, Title - Change title to Archeological Sites identified in ROW for PNM FC Line on Navajo lands within APE.	Change made
257.001	Ms.	Janet	Wilson		06/19/14	Conversion of coal power plants to natural gas (while temporary) is mandated....Develop the solar and wind potential of this area as a long term (2041) goal and in the meantime convert to existing sources of natural gas!	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
258.001	Mr.	Joe	Ward		06/21/14	Close them and install wind turbines rather.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives
259.001	Mr.	Arthur	Yazzie	Tiis Tsoh Sikaad Chapter	June 17 2014	No Substantive Comment	Thank you for your comment.
260.001	Ms.	Mary Ann	Findley		06/22/14	No Substantive Comment	Thank you for your comment.
261.001	Mr.	James	Dietrich		06/16/14	We believe the proposed actions should be approved contingent upon implementing the best available retrofit technology.	The Federal Implementation Plan for FCPP requiring Best available retrofit technology is a decision made by the EPA that is considered as part of the baseline environmental conditions and is not a part of the proposed project. Please see Master Response #12, Placing Conditions on the Lease and Permit approval.
262.001	Ms.	Kyle	Rhodes	Process Equipment & Service Company, Inc. (PESCO)	06/23/14	There is also a huge economic impact to the Navajo Nation and the surrounding area that must be considered and preserved.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
263.001	Mr.	Brik	Moorhead		06/24/14	Lowering the pollution and keeping jobs in the area will help keep the four corners residents healthy and selfreliant, ensuring a prosperous future.	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.
264.001	Mr.	Juan	Reynosa	SWOP	06/24/14	Through the Breathe in NM Campaign, community members collected 12 months worth of air quality samples to better understand what was in the air they were breathing as a result of the activities at the Navajo Mine, as well as the nearby coal-fired power plants. We will be submitting our samples results and final analysis as part of our comments for this EIS process.	The data submitted were reviewed for possible inclusion in the Final EIS. Based on the data collection and reporting methodology provided, it was determined that the study is not appropriate for inclusion in the EIS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data quality assurance and data validation were not sufficiently conducted. For example, data were not accompanied by monitoring flow rates. Measurement of PM10 is flow rate dependent.</li> <li>• Appropriate reference methods do not appear to have been used.</li> <li>• No third party audit of the data was conducted.</li> <li>• Sampling date and schedule determinations are not provided, which makes it possible that the data are completely event-specific data (e.g., only collected on windy days) not a combination of “event” and “non-event” data.</li> </ul>
264.002	Mr.	Juan	Reynosa	SWOP	06/24/14	The Navajo people have a long history of being treated unjustly, and thus why environmental and other justice issues should be weighed even more heavily during this EIS process for the Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. At this point, this EIS does not take justice issues into account enough for this EIS to be deemed as covering all its bases and to be able to be approved.	Environmental justice is addressed in Section 4.11 of the Draft EIS.

264.003	Mr.	Juan	Reynosa	SWOP	<p>06/24/14</p> <p><b>Air Quality</b></p> <p>The fact that the area that encompasses the Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant is now being proven to be the largest point source of pollution in our country should be a large area of focus in the EIS, yet the EIS does not take this into account, nor does it take into account cumulative impacts. When determining whether the Four Corners Power Plant should continue operations into the future, there needs to be a good analysis of how this will continue to contribute to this area being the largest point of pollution in the country, especially when it is impacting the Navajo people disproportionately. Cumulative impacts analysis is an analysis that looks at the impacts of multiple nearby sources of pollution, instead of looking at them source by source. It is obvious that having two large, coal-fired power plants 10 miles away from one another will have huge cumulative impacts on not only human health, but the surrounding wildlife and plant life. There is also a lot of oil and natural gas development in this area, and the pollution impacts from nearby oil and gas development needs to be taken into account within this EIS as well. If cumulative impacts were taken into effect, it will show that this area is even more impacted by air pollution than what the Los Alamos study showed when it did its space analysis to show the area is the largest point source of pollution in our country. Cumulative impacts needs to be taken into account within the air quality analysis of this EIS, or it should be deemed as an incomplete analysis if cumulative impacts are not taking into account. Finally, as noted above, SWOP did a year long citizen science campaign that shows that inhabitants living in the area of the Navajo Mine are breathing in unhealthy amounts of particulate matter and silicates. We worked with Global Community Monitor to train citizens on how to use a particulate monitor, take air quality logs, fill out chain of custody forms, and ship the samples in a timely manner. Between the 2 sites, 50 air samples were taken over a year's time. The data of our report strongly suggests chronic exposure to crystalline silica levels near the Navajo Coal mine that are a public health concern. The conclusion of Dr. Mark Chernaik, who did the sample analysis for us, is as follows: "Emissions of PM10 and crystalline silica by the Navajo Coal Mine are likely creating long-term, unhealthy air quality at residential locations between 900 and 1400 meters from the mine. Investigation into measures to reduce emissions of PM10 and crystalline silica by the Navajo Coal Mine are warranted." Along with this written comment, SWOP will also be submitting our sample results and Dr. Chernaik's final analysis of our year long citizen science campaign. Through this analysis you will see that there is a real need for air quality analysis to be done at the site of the Navajo Mine and at both the San Juan Generating Station and Four Corners Power Plant instead of relying on monitors miles away and using a dispersion model to get air quality data. That is not real air quality data, instead that is data that can be easily skewed to show cleaner air than what actually is. Especially if one of our local labs is now showing the power plants and accompanying mine are now the largest point source of pollution in the United States, then an EIS would</p>	<p>As provided in Section 4.1, the DEIS contains extensive discussion on air quality effects, which serve as the basis for measuring incremental effects to the cumulative environment (Section 4.18.1). See responses to comment 55.002 and Master Comment response number 5. The cumulative effects study area for air quality is the greater Four Corners region, composed of northeastern Arizona, southwestern Colorado, Navajo Nation, and northwestern New Mexico. There are 17 other energy generation facilities occurring with the study area (see Table 4.18-1 and Figure 4.18-1) that represent the other major emission sources in the Four Corners region and are thus the focus of this cumulative analysis.</p> <p>See comment 264.001 for more information regarding the SWOP year-long citizen science campaign.</p>
---------	-----	------	---------	------	--	--

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						not be complete without actual air quality data at the source of the pollution that also takes into account nearby sources of pollution.	
264.004	Mr.	Juan	Reynosa	SWOP	06/24/14	<p><b>Climate change and Drought.</b> Being one of the largest sources of pollution, but also putting out very high amounts of greenhouse gases, which contribute to climate change, the EIS for Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant definitely needs to take this issue into account. This is especially important in regards to extreme drought and water shortages, which is already having a huge impact in the SouthWest as a result of climate change. Even if someone doesn't agree with the very real reality of climate change, the data being put out from LANL on greenhouse gas emissions from power plants in the NorthWest region of New Mexico should prompt a further and more in-depth look at these emissions and its impacts on the environment and connected implications like water shortage. New Mexico and all the surrounding states in the SouthWest are experiencing severe droughts. New Mexico is currently its most severe drought on record and each year the drought data only gets worse. The San Juan-Chama Project coming from the NorthWest part of New Mexico is already starting to not be able to fulfill its part of the water to supply New Mexico's piece of the Rio Grande Compact agreement. As noted before, the coal fired power plants in the area use an extreme amount of water and this should not continue to occur as the SouthWest is forced to deal with the reality of existing with less water each year as drought continues to impact communities. Thus the ongoing drought in our area and it's impacts need to be taken into account into this EIS. The question of how will water be supplied to the power plants when there is less and less water to be used is one that needs to be addressed. What water use will be prioritized in the area? Will the Navajo people once again be disproportionately impacted in regards to water access in order for this coal plant to continue operations in the future? Nothing in the EIS addresses this issue and this needs to be taken into account especially with water supplies dwindling in the SouthWest.</p>	Climate change is addressed in Section 4.2 of the Draft EIS. Section 4.18 further considers the cumulative impacts of climate change in a multi-media sense. See responses to comment 55.002 and Master Comment response #5.
264.005	Mr.	Juan	Reynosa	SWOP	06/24/14	<p><b>Alternative Sources of Energy Production.</b> The SouthWest region has many viable options for energy production besides relying on oil, gas, coal, and nuclear. In the SouthEast part of New Mexico wind and solar production are picking up. Texas has just declared they will be producing coal free energy by 2016. Why should New Mexico not continue to move in this direction of cleaner energy that uses less water. This Environmental Impact Statement needs to consider renewable energy options further and more explicitly instead of solely relying on prolonging the life of the Four Corners Power Plant. The Four Corners region of New Mexico is ready and fully capable of harnessing solar and wind energy, which then can be transmitted via transmission lines to large usage hubs like Albuquerque. There needs to be a good analysis in this EIS to show how renewable energy and energy efficiency options line up versus continuing on with coal use. What needs to be looked upon is not only the difference in environmental impacts per pollution outputs, but also the difference in water usage amongst the two options. Also, the</p>	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						economic benefits in terms of job potential for renewable energy outweighs the job potential for coal produced energy and that should be taken into account.	
265.001	Mr.	Charley	Tyler		06/24/14	No substantive comment	Thank you for your comment.
266.001	Mr.	Harry	Martin		06/24/14	I have worked for the mine for 20 +years , raised a family of 5 children , put them through school , and I also help my elderly parents with finances , my family would be devastated with out my help , Thank you	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
267.001	Ms.	Jamie	Mead		06/24/14	The loss of FCPP and the Navajo Mine would be of great devastation to the Navajo Nation as well as the surrounding Four Corners area.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
268.001	Mr.	Mark	Martinez		06/24/14	The quality of life that I currently have I owe in a large part to the mine. I have seen the volume of personnel employed by the mine and power plant and the families that are impacted by their operation.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
269.001	Mr.	Mark	Walser		06/24/14	This power plant deserves no more than a five year license renewal (time for other energy development) and should be taken down and replaced by safer and more sustainable energyproducing technologies.	Please see Master Response #3, Alternatives with Shorter Lease Term
269.002	Mr.	Mark	Walser		06/24/14	It is my opinion that although coal power is not a solution for the future, it would hurt the economic growth of the Navajo Nation to shut it down immediately.	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS and will notify the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in spring 2015.
270.001	Mr.	Morgan R.	Nelson	NMED	06/24/14	Air Quality Bureau. The Air Quality Bureau has evaluated the information submitted with respect to the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine Energy Project. San Juan County is currently considered to be in attainment with all New Mexico and National Ambient Air Quality Standards. The project is on Navajo Nation sovereign lands. Air quality regulation is under the jurisdiction of the Navajo Nation Environmental Protection Agency and overseen by EPA Region IX. Arizona Public Service is now operating under a Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) for Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART) at the Four Corners Power Plant. The Air Quality Bureau submitted comments on the original BART proposal. In addition to the power plant this project addresses many other sources of air pollution including a myriad of emissions from maintenance and development of the mine. Best operating practices should be used and emissions mitigated from these activities. The current ozone design value for San Juan County is 0.071 ppm. EPA is currently reviewing the existing national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS) for ozone, which is 0.075 ppm. The states of Colorado and New Mexico convened the Four Corners Air Quality Task Force (Task Force) in November 2005 to address air quality issues in the Four Corners region and consider options to mitigate air pollution. Increased natural resource and industrial development and population growth in the area are contributing to air quality concerns including relatively high levels of ozone and regional haze. Many residents are concerned with potential health impacts from air pollutants, and input from area residents is	Thank you for the comment confirming the Draft EIS analysis that San Juan County is currently considered to be in attainment with all New Mexico and National Ambient Air Quality Standards. The Draft EIS incorporated air quality issues and options to reduce air pollution developed by the Four Corners Air Quality Task Force, as mentioned in the comment. A complete discussion of Air Quality is provided in Section 4.1 of the Draft EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						important in developing and implementing an effective management plan. In addition to Colorado and New Mexico, other participating agencies in the Task Force included the Navajo Nation Environmental Protection Agency; the Southern Ute Indian Tribe Air Quality Program; the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); the U.S. Department of Interior - Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and National Park Service; the U.S. Department of Agriculture - Forest Service (USFS); the U.S. Department of Energy; and the State of Utah. Some of the air pollutants addressed by the Task Force were: ozone, volatile organic compounds, nitrogen oxides, particulate matter, sulfur dioxide, and mercury. The Task Force met face-to-face on a quarterly basis from November 2005 through November 2007. These meetings took place in Farmington, New Mexico and Durango and Cortez, Colorado. The Task Force developed a 550 page report of over 200 mitigation options for improving air quality in the region, available at <a href="http://www.nmenv.state.nm.us/aqb/4C/TaskForceReport.html">http://www.nmenv.state.nm.us/aqb/4C/TaskForceReport.html</a> . Many of the options are focused on reducing emissions from power plants. Due to continued interest in air quality issues, the members and interested parties continue to follow air quality progress in the region as the Four Corners Air Quality Group (Group or 4CAQG). There are over 500 participants in the Group. The Group continues to provide a forum for learning and the exchange of ideas and information on air quality issues. The Group also keeps the Four Corners Air Quality website, <a href="http://www.nmenv.state.nm.us/aqb/4C/FAQ.html">http://www.nmenv.state.nm.us/aqb/4C/FAQ.html</a> , operational to provide a tool for information sharing which may be useful to the contractors and operators in this project.	
270.002	Mr.	Morgan R.	Nelson	NMED		The FCPP and Navajo Mine are entirely on Navajo Tribal Trust Lands and therefore, outside the GWQB's jurisdiction. However, implementation of construction activities and mining operations will likely involve the use of heavy equipment, thereby leading to a possibility of contaminant releases (e.g., fuel, hydraulic fluid, etc.) associated with equipment malfunctions. The GWQB advises all parties involved in the project to take appropriate corrective actions in the event an accidental discharge occurs. Appropriate corrective actions will ensure the protection of ground water quality in the vicinity of the project area.	Thank you for your comment. As described in Section 3.2.6 of the Draft EIS, the Navajo Mine maintains and implements a SPCC Plan and a SPCC Plan will be implemented at the FCPP. The SPCC Plan identifies areas of risk, specifies appropriate control measures, and provides a list of response actions that will be taken in the event of a release.  Best management practices to reduce the occurrence of leaks and spills, and contingency measures, are discussed in Sections 2, 3, and 4.5 of the Draft EIS.
270.003	Mr.	Morgan R.	Nelson	NMED		Surface Water Quality Bureau. The activities described in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement are not regulated by the New Mexico Environment Surface Water Quality Bureau has no comments. Thank you for this opportunity to comment. I hope you find this information helpful.	Thank you for your comment.
271.001	Mr.	Rod	Troxell		06/24/14	I am a Farmington resident and believe the final impact to our community and the Navajo Nation would suffer if the local power plants had to shut down completely.	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS and will notify the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in spring 2015.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
272.001	Mr.	Shane	Galloway		06/24/14	The re-fitting of Units 4 & 5 with pollution reduction equipment plus the de-commissioning of Units 1, 2 & 3 is a satisfactory and reasonable plan to keep hundreds of jobs and millions of dollars in our area, especially the Navajo Nation.	Thank you for your comment. For clarification, the Federal Implementation Plan for the FCPP is a separate action conducted by the EPA and is considered as a baseline condition in the EIS. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.
273.001	Ms.	Alicia	Corbell		06/25/14	The economic impact to the Four Corners area is vital. With their commitment to installing advanced environment controls I am confident that the facility will then be one of the cleanest in the nation.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS. A discussion of the air emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan for the FCPP is provided in Section 4.1.3 of the Draft EIS.
274.001	Ms.	Georgia	Gramlich	Bank of the Southwest & 4CED	06/25/14	The economic impact these two companies provide the four corners area is substantial. Without them our economy would experiencesignificant economic hardship. Considering that we have we have great economic challenges already. I believe the plan adequately addresses the environmental issues as well as our economy.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
275.001	Mr.	Vincent H.	Yazzie		06/25/14	Four Corners Power Plant (FCPP) exceeds capacity. SCR only designed for 1.540 GW. FCPP will not be able to handle the extra ammonia from the SCR. Unit 4 can exceed 0.80 GW. There were exceptions to BART settlement which was the ability of FCPP to handle the ammonia. FCPP needs to install and engineer an ammonia system for a power plant capacity of 1.62 GW if FCPP unit 5 can later reach 0.81 GW Lines 92 to 181 is Four Corners power plant unit 4. Total Power (GW) is the addition of the power of units 4 and 5. Unit 4 can exceed 40% efficiency which might be impossible. Unit 5 efficiency looks about right. Have not calculated carbon content of the coal.	The capacity of Units 4 and 5 is discussed in Section 2 and 3 of the EIS, and is based on historical performance. The SCR is designed to accommodate this maximum performance. In addition, EIS provides analysis of risks and hazards associated with the ammonia source for the selective catalytic reduction (SCR) devices. The devices will be engineered to meet the requirements of BART. Operational output for Units 4 and 5 with SCR equipment installed are analyzed in the EIS.
276.001	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)	26-Jun-14	<p>APS recommends that OSMRE and the cooperating agencies select Alternative D, which includes an alternative ash disposal configuration, but is otherwise identical to the Proposed Action...</p> <p>APS recommends that OSMRE and the cooperating agencies select Alternative D, which includes an alternative ash disposal configuration, but is identical to the Proposed Action in all other respects. Alternative D proposes an alternative ash disposal configuration that would disturb fewer acres and would not require impoundment walls and roads through the ash disposal area at FCPP.5 APS agrees that the alternative ash disposal configuration meets the purpose and need for the action and is both technically and economically feasible. See DEIS at 3-28. The DEIS notes (at 3-27) that this alternative was considered for its potential to reduce environmental effects of the proposed ash disposal configuration. APS supports selection of the ash disposal configuration in Alternative D.</p>	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.002	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)	26-Jun-14	As the DEIS indicates (at 2-35), APS will install Selective Catalytic Reduction (SCR) on Units 4 and 5 to reduce nitrogen oxides (NOX) emissions in compliance with FCPP's source-specific Federal Implementation Plan promulgated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Operation of SCR requires an ammonia reagent, and the DEIS analyzes impacts of various potential sources of ammonia. See, e.g., DEIS sections 4.9, 4.11, 4.15 and 4.17. <b>OSMRE recommends urea as the ammonia supply option, citing significantly greater transportation safety. After consideration of the DEIS and other factors, APS has selected urea as its ammonia source. APS requests that the final EIS reflect this selection.</b>	Comment Noted and the Final EIS will reflect this selection.
276.003	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)	26-Jun-14	As discussed in section VIII below and in Attachment C, APS's coal combustion residual (CCR) disposal procedures will meet regulatory requirements adopted by EPA. The DEIS incorrectly states that APS may be exempt from these requirements, depending upon EPA's final regulations governing CCR. For the reasons described below and in Attachment C, <b>there will be no regulatory gap, and APS requests that the final EIS reflect this fact.</b>	EPA published its Final Rule for Hazardous and Solid Waste Management System; Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals from Electrical Utilities on December 19, 2014. The Final EIS has been updated accordingly to reflect this new rule and its applicability to the FCPP. A comprehensive discussion of the rule, its provisions, and enforceability is provided in Section 4.15, Hazardous Materials and Wastes. In addition, specific provisions of the rule that apply to other resource areas (i.e., Water and Air) are included in Sections 4.1, 4.5, 4.11, 4.17, and 4.18.
276.004	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)	26-Jun-14	As noted in the DEIS, FCPP's post-2016 operations will achieve substantial emission reductions over historic operations. On August 6, 2012, EPA issued a source-specific Federal Implementation Plan requiring FCPP to achieve air emissions reductions under the Clean Air Act's Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART) provisions. APS's compliance with the implementation plan will be achieved by shutting down Units 1, 2 and 3, which were retired on December 30, 2013, and installing SCR on Units 4 and 5, which will commence in 2017 and 2018, respectively.  Specifically, post-2016 operations would substantially reduce coal consumption and air emissions in comparison with historic operations. The closure of Units 1, 2 and 3 will result in more than a 30 percent reduction in the amount of coal burned. By shutting down Units 1, 2 and 3 and adding SCR equipment to Units 4 and 5, the following reductions in emissions of air pollutants are projected to occur, compared to existing conditions at the time that APS submitted the lease amendment and rights-of-way applications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Nitrogen oxides - 87 percent reduction</li> <li>· Mercury - 67 percent reduction</li> <li>· Particulates - 58 percent reduction</li> <li>· Carbon dioxide - 26 percent reduction</li> <li>· Sulfur dioxide - 18 percent reduction</li> </ul> Shutting down Units 1, 2 and 3 will also reduce water consumption by nearly two billion gallons per year.	Thank you for your comment. That is the description of the baseline conditions during the interim period of 2014 to 2018, during which time the FIP for BART will be implemented.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.005	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)	26-Jun-14	<p>APS also plans to close its existing lined ash impoundment. The scrubbers on Units 1, 2 and 3 contributed the majority of waste to the existing lined ash impoundment, but this waste stream was eliminated with the closure of these units. Therefore, storage of ash and scrubber sludge in ash impoundments will be discontinued at FCPP. Units 4 and 5 Flue Gas Desulfurization sludge is currently pumped to the lined ash impoundment. However, upon closure of the lined ash impoundment, the Flue Gas Desulfurization slurry will be mixed with fly ash and placed into the Dry Fly Ash Disposal Area.</p>	<p>This has been clarified in Section 3, which already described that upon closure, the FGD slurry would be mixed with fly ash and placed in the DFADAs. In addition, EPA published its Final Rule for Hazardous and Solid Waste Management System; Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals from Electrical Utilities on December 19, 2014. The Final EIS has been updated accordingly to reflect this new rule and its applicability to the FCPP. A comprehensive discussion of the rule, its provisions, and enforceability is provided in Section 4.15, Hazardous Materials and Wastes. In addition, specific provisions of the rule that apply to other resource areas (i.e., Water and Air) are included in Sections 4.1, 4.5, 4.11, 4.17, and 4.18.</p>
276.006	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)	26-Jun-14	<p>As previously noted, APS will achieve required NOX reductions through the operation of SCR on Units 4 and 5. The use of SCR tends to oxidize some sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) to sulfur trioxide (SO<sub>3</sub>), which results in increased sulfuric acid (H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>) mist above the Prevention of Section Significant Deterioration (PSD) significant emission threshold. Therefore, APS has applied for a</p> <p>PSD permit from EPA. In order to minimize H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>, emission increases, APS proposes to install a dry sorbent injection system, using hydrated lime as the sorbent. A pneumatic dry sorbent truck unloading system and silo will be installed. Hydrated lime will be received by truck and pneumatically conveyed to a storage silo. The lime silo will be approximately 14 feet in diameter and 80 feet tall, including lime transport equipment beneath the silo. The use of dry sorbent injection will result in emission reduction benefits. The environmental impacts of using dry sorbent injection are minimal and a fraction of the impacts analyzed in the DEIS for ammonia—mainly a small increase in truck traffic for the transport of hydrated lime, which is in a dry powder form. The use of dry sorbent injection is expected to require approximately 900 trucks per year, delivering 10,800 tons per year of hydrated lime. The air emission sources associated with the use of lime will be truck travel on paved roads and a vent on the silo, which will have a baghouse for emissions control. Importantly, all construction will occur within the existing plant site in industrial areas and areas of previous disturbance.</p> <p><b>APS requests that OSMRE incorporate this information regarding the use of dry sorbent injection in section 2.4.2.2 of the DEIS, which describes Actions to Comply with BART Ruling. APS also requests that OSMRE incorporate discussion of the transport of hydrated lime in appropriate places in section 4, where the DEIS analyzes potential ammonia transport impacts. See, e.g., 4.9, 4.11, 4.15, 4.18.</b></p>	<p>Description incorporated into Section 2.4.2.2 as well as chapter 4, Sections 4.9, 4.11, 4.15, 4.18. The updated information does not change the results of those resource evaluations.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.007	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)	26-Jun-14	APS believes that the adverse impacts of the No Action Alternative may be even greater than projected in the DEIS	The socioeconomic analysis of the impacts of No Action to the Navajo Nation were based on the ASU study, the most comprehensive evaluation of these effects. The model that was used, IMPLAN, does not have data to support an analysis of the additional socioeconomic benefits brought by the project (referred to as the “multiplier effect”); such analysis was performed for San Juan County and the State of New Mexico. The Draft EIS included a qualitative description of how the multiplier effect would operate in the Navajo Nation. Although the quantified effects of No Action would likely be higher, the Draft EIS relied on the qualitative addition to the ASU study to bound the potential effects.
276.008	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)	26-Jun-14	The DEIS states that, due to lost royalties and tax revenue, the Navajo Nation would be expected to lose between approximately \$40 and \$60 million per year from a closure of the FCPP and Navajo Mine, which would result in major adverse impacts for the Navajo Nation. Id. at 4.10-27, 4.10-31. However, the significance of the Project’s financial contributions that would be lost by the Navajo Nation is even more substantial when compared to the overall Navajo Nation budget. The DEIS notes that tribal taxes and royalties paid by the FCPP and Navajo Mine make up approximately one-third of the Navajo Nation’s General Fund revenues. 9 See id. at 4.10-30 – 4.10-31. The taxes and royalty revenues the Navajo Nation receives from the FCPP and Navajo Mine are a crucial source of funding for many Navajo Nation public services, which are already struggling to provide emergency medicine, police, fire, and other services because of resource constraints. See id. at 4.10-19, 4.10-22.	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE agrees, and a complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the draft EIS.
276.009	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)	26-Jun-14	The DEIS notes that the baseline fiscal contribution of the Navajo Mine to the Navajo Nation Transitional Energy Company (NTEC), a wholly owned limited liability company of the Navajo Nation, <b>is expected to be higher than the estimated \$28.1 million under the previous ownership</b> because NTEC would be exempt from some local, state, and federal taxes that the previous owner paid. Id. at 4.10-27. The ASU Study quantifies the benefits to the Navajo Nation <b>from tax exemptions as totaling \$17.9 million per year. The DEIS understates the adverse impacts of the No Action Alternative by not expressly including these benefits to the Navajo Nation that are expected from tax exemptions resulting from NTEC’s ownership of the Navajo Mine.</b>	The tax exemption information has been added to Section 4.10.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.010	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)	26-Jun-14	Additionally, the DEIS references the development of renewable energy production as potential mitigation of the major adverse socioeconomic impacts of the No Action Alternative. See DEIS at 4.10-30. <b>However, it is unlikely that renewable energy development would materially reduce economic harm to compensate for the FCPP and Navajo Mine closure in the short-term.</b> As the DEIS notes (at 4.10-27), the Navajo Nation resolution that authorized the formation of NTEC directs NTEC to invest 10 percent of NTEC's profits from Navajo Mine operations in research and development of renewable and alternative sources of energy, storage, and transmission technologies. While these longterm research and development efforts will lead to job creation in renewable and alternative energy development, <b>it will take substantial financial resources (including the revenue the Navajo Nation receives from the Navajo Mine)</b> and time to build this new sector of the Navajo Nation economy. As such, renewable energy development and production will not—and cannot—mitigate the immediate adverse socioeconomic impacts from halting FCPP and Navajo Mine operations in 2016 under the No Action Alternative.	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015. With regard to renewable energy, please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives.
276.011	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)	26-Jun-14	APS requests a clarification in the socioeconomic analysis in the final EIS. The DEIS indicates that the use and transportation of ammonia for FCPP operations under the Proposed Action could impact Navajo Nation public services if an accidental release occurred. DEIS at 4.10-29. APS notes that its selection of urea as the FCPP's ammonia source greatly reduces the risk of such an accidental release because urea is transported as a solid. Id. at 4.15-19. <b>APS requests that its selection of urea be reflected in the socioeconomics evaluation of the Proposed Action in the final EIS.</b>	There will be a global clarification to address APS' selection of the urea option for ammonia transport.
276.012	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)	26-Jun-14	In sum, the Project provides crucial social and economic benefits to the Navajo Nation, including high-skilled, high-paying jobs and taxes and royalties to the Navajo Nation. Selection of the No Action Alternative, halting operations of the FCPP and Navajo Mine, would result in substantial harm to the Navajo Nation, due to the loss of these benefits.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS. This section, as well as Environmental Justice, is being augmented with additional socioeconomic effects to the Navajo Nation as a result of the No Action alternative.
276.013	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)	26-Jun-14	The "preferred alternative" is one that the agency "believes would fulfill its statutory mission and responsibilities, giving consideration to economic, environmental, technical and other factors." See Council on Environmental Quality, "Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ's National Environmental Policy Act Regulations," 46 Fed. Reg. 18026, 18027 (Mar. 23, 1981). Here, the Proposed Action, with the replacement of the ash disposal configuration from Alternative D, best meets those factors for a number of reasons.	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.014	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)	26-Jun-14	The DEIS states that negotiations are ongoing with the Hopi Tribe regarding the right-of-way renewal on Hopi land for APS's 500 kV line. DEIS at Executive Summary xii. However, <b>APS and Hopi have reached agreement on that right-of-way renewal and the renewal was submitted to the BIA Western Region office for review and agency action. This agreement should be reflected in the final EIS.</b>	The text has been updated in the Final EIS.
276.015	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)	26-Jun-14	The DEIS properly explains that BIA actions include both the approval of both right - of- way renewals and the lease extension for the FCPP plant area. See, e.g., id. at Executive Summary i, xii, xix, 1-1. <b>APS requests that all discussions of BIA's action for the FCPP plant site consistently acknowledge both rights-of-way renewal and the lease extension approval throughout the final EIS.</b> See, e.g., id. at Table ES-2, Executive Summary iii, v, vii.	Approval of Lease Amendment No. 3 includes the ROW approvals for Moenkopi Substation and ancillary facilities. No change made.
276.016	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)	26-Jun-14	The DEIS correctly notes that BIA's rights-of-way approvals include Moenkopi Substation and ancillary facilities (at 1-11) in addition to APS's transmission lines that are part of the Proposed Action. <b>APS requests that this description consistently be carried throughout the final EIS.</b> See, e.g., id. at Table ES-2.	Approval of Lease Amendment No. 3 includes the ROW approvals for Moenkopi Substation and ancillary facilities. No change made.
276.017	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)	26-Jun-14	The DEIS correctly notes that the BIA must approve rights-of-way renewals for APS's 500 kV and 345 kV transmission lines. See id. at 1-11. <b>The DEIS incorrectly states that Proposed Action also requires a BLM approval for APS's 500 kV line. There is no BLM land within the boundaries of the Navajo Nation or the Hopi Tribe. APS requests that the final EIS reflect that the Proposed Action only includes BIA approvals for APS's 500 kV transmission line.</b> See, e.g., id. at Table ES-2, vi, Table 1-1, 1-10 and 11.	The text has been updated in the Final EIS.
276.018	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)	26-Jun-14	APS requests that OSMRE <b>remove the following item from the table of proposed actions (Table ES-2 and Table 1-1) listed for EPA: "Ensure that emissions from the FCPP comply with the Clean Air Act during modification of Title V Operating Permit and Title IV Acid Rain Permits." As noted above, EPA's actions under the Clean Air Act are not subject to NEPA review, 15 U.S.C. § 793(c)(1), so these permitting items do not belong in the table of authority and actions.</b>	The text above the table states that some of the actions require NEPA review. It doesn't state that all actions in the table require NEPA review. No Change made

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.019	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)	26-Jun-14	APS requests that OSMRE remove the following statement from Section 5.1.4.1 (Water Resources): <i>“Any activity requiring a Federal permit, license, or approval that results in a discharged [sic] into a water of the U.S. must receive Clean Water Act Section 401 Certification. In this case, the certification would be issued by the NNEPA Water Quality Program verifying that the Navajo Nation Surface Water Quality Standards will be met when the discharge occurs.”</i> (emphasis added.) In EPA’s Decision Document for the Approval of the Navajo Nation Application for Treatment in the Same Manner as a State for Sections 303(c) and 401 of the Clean Water Act dated January 20, 2006, EPA explains that in its application for treatment as a state, the Navajo Nation expressly excluded Morgan Lake from the scope of the application. As a result, EPA concluded that the application “effectively does not include land the Tribe leases for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Generating Station,” including Morgan Lake. Moreover, Section 17 of the lease between the Navajo Nation and FCPP participants prohibits the applicability of Navajo Nation Surface Water Quality Standards to FCPP. Accordingly, the italicized language above should not be included in the final EIS.	Please see Master Response #11, Covenant 17
276.020	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)	26-Jun-14	APS has determined that there are economic and reliability reasons that preclude converting the FCPP to gas or renewable power generation.	Thank you for your comment. Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives
276.021	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)	26-Jun-14	OSMRE correctly concluded that conversion of the FCPP to a natural gas-fired, biomass-fired, or solar, wind or geothermal power plant would not meet the purpose and need for the proposed action. DEIS at 3-2, 3-48. APS agrees that such conversion would discontinue use of Navajo coal, eliminating the resulting coal royalties to the Navajo Nation. It would also reduce or eliminate hundreds of mining jobs at the Navajo Mine. Conversion of FCPP to non-coal-fired energy would result in adverse economic impacts to the Navajo Nation and surrounding communities, compared to the Proposed Action. And the FCPP lease requires coal as the primary fuel. In addition, several other considerations preclude the conversion of the FCPP to an alternative energy source.	Page 3-51 of the Draft EIS states that the lease for FCPP requires coal to be the primary fuel for the plant. This has also been added to page 3-50. The Draft EIS notes that a new lease would need to be reviewed and approved for its tribal trust responsibilities.
276.022	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)	26-Jun-14	While conversion of coal-fired power plants to natural gas is technically feasible, at FCPP it would require a much greater volume of gas supply. The infrastructure currently in place at FCPP only provides sufficient volume of natural gas to ignite boilers at startup and for other minor uses. <b>Therefore, APS would need to construct a large diameter distribution pipeline from a nearby transmission pipeline to the FCPP.</b> APS would also have to undergo the operational and engineering adjustments described in the DEIS. See DEIS at 3-49.	The following sentence is already in the Draft EIS: APS would also need to secure a larger supply of gas from a nearby transmission pipeline and install a large-diameter distribution pipeline to the existing power plant site. No change made.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.023	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)	26-Jun-14	Importantly, it would not be economically feasible for APS to undergo the expense of converting the FCPP to natural gas. <b>Converting the FCPP boilers to combust natural gas would be much less efficient than building new natural gas combined cycle units closer to APS's load centers in Arizona.</b> Building new combined cycle units would improve the fuel to electricity efficiency from about 37 percent to 49 percent, in comparison to converting the existing coal-fired units to natural gas. However, building a new combined cycle unit closer to APS's load center would not meet the purpose and need because it would not benefit the Navajo Nation through jobs, taxes, and royalties, and it would not support Navajo Nation production of its own coal resources.	The following text has been added to the Final EIS: Further, it would be more economically efficient to build a new natural gas combined cycle units near major load centers than it would be to convert the existing units at FCPP.
276.024	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)	26-Jun-14	<p><b>Converting to natural gas would also be economically infeasible because of changes to dispatch of Units 4 and 5. Units 4 and 5 currently operate as baseload units.</b> They provide low cost energy and are generally operated 24 hours per day, seven days per week. In a utility's dispatch order, a coal-fired unit would typically be called upon to operate after nuclear, hydro and must-take contracts, and before natural gas units. <b>If FCPP Units 4 and 5 were to be repowered to run on natural gas, their dispatch cost would increase so that they would be called upon after coal units and also after high efficiency combined cycle units.</b> Combined cycles are more efficient, with heat rates around 7,000 Btu/kWh, while the FCPP heat rate would be in the 9,700 Btu/kWh range after conversion to natural gas. For individual owners, this would likely put the FCPP into the "peaking range" of operation, creating two major issues:</p> <p>1. Coal units—especially the FCPP, which is a supercritical plant—were designed for baseload operation, and the operating characteristics are not conducive to cycling or peaking operation. Peaking units typically run a few to several hours per day during the utility's peak months, and can easily be started and stopped to meet the utility's load requirements and system contingencies. Supercritical boilers such as the FCPP can take 24 hours to start, and must stay on line for at least 24 hours as well. Even if the boilers were converted to natural gas, they would still be very slow to start up, given the large quantity of metal to heat up in equilibrium. With these inflexible operating characteristics, the plant would either be started too early and be shut down too late, or not be called upon at all when it would otherwise be needed. Furthermore, the operating characteristics would not be useful for meeting system contingencies and operating reserves.</p> <p>2. The FCPP is a joint participation plant with five owners. If any individual owner calls on power from the plant, it must be dispatched and each of the owners must take at least their pro-rata minimum load from the plant. For peaking units, it is likely that one owner would call on a unit while other owners would not. The other owners then would be taking their share of the output uneconomically. For them, the operation</p>	The following sentence was added to the paragraph: In addition, Units 4 and 5 are designed to operate as baseload units and are not conducive to cycling or peaking operation. If FCPP were converted to natural gas, the dispatch cost of operating Units 4 and 5 would increase substantially and the units would no longer provide baseload power.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						of the FCPP would be displacing more efficient, and likely environmentally cleaner, generation.	
276.025	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)	26-Jun-14	Finally, developing new gas-fired generation on the lease site concurrently with decommissioning the FCPP coal units, were that scenario considered, would present significant operational challenges.	Thank you for your comment. Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives
276.026	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		OSMRE properly concluded (at 3-49) that wind power would not provide uninterrupted power supply to electricity customers. Wind is an intermittent resource and wind energy production primarily occurs in the spring, when APS customer loads are reduced. <sup>14</sup> In contrast, the FCPP is designed to run twenty-four hours a day for most days of the year. Furthermore, <b>wind would not be feasible at the Four Corners lease site because the area is not a candidate for sufficient wind to support this type of generation.</b> A 2009 Western Renewable Energy Zones – Phase 1 Report conducted by the Western Governors’ Association and U.S. Department of Energy, <b>identified a significant amount of potentially developable wind resources in eastern and southeastern New Mexico, but did not identify such wind resources in northwest New Mexico.</b>	The following paragraph has been added: FCPP conversion to wind power is feasible; however, FCPP is designed to operate 24 hours per day 365 days per year and there is not sufficient wind in the region to support this level of operation. A substantial amount of potentially developable wind resources have been identified in eastern and southeastern New Mexico, but not in the northwestern portion of the state.
276.027	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		In the Coal Retirement Scenario shown above, energy production from more than 1,700 MW of coal to be retired is replaced by 25 percent renewable energy and 75 percent gas generation. The nameplate capacity of a renewable resource required to meet 25 percent of coal generation capacity is more than 1,000 MW. <sup>18</sup> With respect to system reliability, this 1,000 MW of renewable nameplate capacity is worth only 167 MW of dependable capacity as shown above and, accordingly, is not sufficient to satisfy APS’s baseload generation needs to ensure affordable and reliable energy service for its customers	The following sentence was added to the discussion of technical feasibility of solar power: The nameplate capacity of a renewable resource required to meet 25 percent of coal generation capacity is more than 1,000 MW. With respect to system reliability, this 1,000 MW of renewable nameplate capacity is equivalent to only 167 MW of dependable capacity as shown above, and accordingly, is not sufficient to provide baseload generation.
276.028	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		APS summarized the technical challenges to integrating a solar/coal hybrid at the FCPP in the 2014 Integrated Resources Plan:  One of the strongest considerations is that the Four Corners 4 & 5 units are supercritical boiler technology. No CSP is designed or under consideration today that will be able to be compatible with the high pressure, supercritical steam conditions and only the power tower technology would potentially be able to meet intermediate pressure steam conditions. As was discussed, power tower technology is still untested at utility scale and is the more expensive option. This means that all energy would need to be added at the lower energy points in the system which reduces the efficiency gains in the cycle. The power tower also requires more land for the same energy.	The following sentence was added to Section 3.3.2.4: <u>In particular, Units 4 and 5 operate with supercritical boiler technology. No CSP is designed currently that would be compatible with the high-pressure, supercritical steam conditions of Units 4 and 5.</u>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.029	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>While EPA has recently proposed standards of performance for CO2 reductions for n power plants, requiring partial CCS, EPA has also determined not to consider partial CCS in its proposal for existing power plants.<sup>33</sup> EPA recognized that there are different considerations for existing power plants, including space constraints. While EPA noted that there are pilot-scale demonstrations of partial CCS, EPA did not cite any existing utility-scale CCS installation (on either a new or existing power plant) that is in operation anywhere in the world.<sup>34</sup> There are a number of challenges to incorporating CCS at existing power plants, including: (1) technical challenges of the CO2 separation and capture technology; (2) transport and storage of CO2; and (3) measurement, monitoring and verification.</p>	<p>The following sentence was added to 3.3.3.4: Further, while EPA has recently proposed standards of performance for CO2 reductions for new power plants, requiring partial carbon capture and storage, EPA has also determined not to consider partial carbon capture and storage in its proposal for existing power plants. There are a number of challenges to incorporating carbon capture and storage at existing power plants, including: (1) technical challenges of the CO2 separation and capture technology; (2) transport and storage of CO2; and (3) measurement, monitoring and verification.</p>
276.030	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p><b>APS requests that OSMRE remove from the final EIS any suggestion that APS might seek a new lease for the FCPP with the Navajo Nation under 25 U.S.C. § 415(e) if BIA does not approve Lease Amendment No. 3 for the FCPP.</b> See, e.g., DEIS at 4.11-36. APS does not intend to seek a section 415(e) lease for two reasons:</p> <p>(1) If the BIA denies Lease Amendment No. 3, there is no time to renegotiate a new lease with the Nation under 25 U.S.C. § 415(e). APS and the other Four Corners participants must make a decision on whether to expend hundreds of millions to retrofit Units 4 and 5 with SCR. Lease Amendment No. 3 took approximately three years to negotiate. The BART Federal Implementation Plan for the FCPP requires installation and operation of SCR by July 2018, and investments must be made starting in 2015. Due to the time required to purchase and construct the equipment, the hundreds of millions in expenditures for SCR cannot reasonably be expected to be made absent the timely federal actions required to ensure uninterrupted coal supply to the FCPP and lease and rights-of-way extensions.</p> <p>(2) As part of arms-length negotiations between APS and the Navajo Nation, the Nation has granted APS a covenant not to regulate, which means that the Nation has agreed it will not directly or indirectly regulate or attempt to regulate the Company or the construction, maintenance, or operation of the power plant and transmission system by the Company. This covenant not to regulate was approved or otherwise reaffirmed by the Nation consistent with the 1960 Lease, the 1966 Supplemental and Additional Lease, the 1985 Amendment, and again in 2011 with Lease Amendment No. 2 and Lease Amendment No. 3. The Department of the Interior has similarly approved the Lease and amendments containing the covenant not to regulate each time this question was before it. APS does not intend to change its position on this issue in order to seek a new lease for the FCPP with the Navajo Nation under 25 U.S.C. § 415(e).</p>	<p>The reference speaks only to the regulatory possibility of this option. APS is not in any way committed to following this path.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.031	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		APS notes that the covenant not to regulate is properly acknowledged in numerous places throughout the DEIS, see, e.g., 4.1, 4.5 and 4.8. APS requests that the covenant be reflected consistently throughout the final EIS, including the discussion of biological resources and sensitive species in sections 1.3 and 1.4.	The document has been revised to ensure that the covenant not to regulate is consistently and accurately referenced throughout the document.
276.032	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		Finally, while the DEIS states that the No Action Alternative would have “no impacts” on air quality and climate change, see, e.g., Table 3-12, APS notes that there may be some impacts from the No Action Alternative. If the FCPP shuts down, the power generation would be needed from other sources. It is highly unlikely that this power generation would be replaced entirely by zero emission sources. Thus, the air emissions and climate impacts would not likely be eliminated. Rather, the impacts would come from other power plants in the region, including, potentially, those with less controlled emissions. APS agrees with OSMRE that it is not possible to predict how FCPP generation would be replaced. <b>Therefore, the air quality and climate change impacts from the No Action Alternative are unknown.</b>	The source of energy that would be needed to replace energy from the FCPP under the No Action Alternative is speculative, and although in the long term the air quality impact is not known, in the short term there would be no impact.
276.033	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		APS has selected urea as its source of ammonia for SCR operation. The final EIS should reflect this selection and should explain how the selection of urea minimizes potential impacts analyzed in DEIS, including health and safety, hazardous and solid waste, and environmental justice impacts.	The EIS has been updated in multiple places to reflect APS’ choice of urea as its source of ammonia for SCR operation. The updates include how the selected option minimizes potential impacts, including health and safety, hazardous and solid waste, and environmental justice. See also response to Comment 276.006.
276.034	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		As noted above, the DEIS evaluates an alternative ash disposal configuration, Alternative D, which would disturb fewer acres and would eliminate the number of impoundment walls and roads through the CCR area. APS recommends that the ash disposal configuration in Alternative D be adopted by OSMRE instead of the ash disposal configuration evaluated as part of the Proposed Action, with a minor clarification of the description, as indicated in Attachment A at 3.	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.
276.035	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		The vast majority of ash disposal at the FCPP over the life of the project will be dry ash disposal—the DFADA configurations in both the Alternative D and the Proposed Action involve the disposal of dry ash. While dry ash is typically mixed with a small amount of water for dust control and compaction, dry ash disposal facilities are entirely distinguishable from wet ash impoundments that contain ash slurry. Unlike the wet ash impoundment failures that have been highlighted in the news, the DFADA will pose no risk of dam failure or flow of ash slurry offsite to Chaco Wash.	The following sentence has been added to Section 3: While dry ash is typically mixed with a small amount of water for dust control and compaction, dry ash disposal facilities are entirely distinguishable from wet ash impoundments that contain ash slurry (described in Section 2). As such, no impoundments would be constructed and berms and contouring would be developed to manage stormwater (100yr storm event) within the DFADAs away from Chaco River.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.036	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>APS provides the following additional clarification for inclusion in the final EIS. As described in Section 4.15 in the DEIS, EPA has proposed two regulatory options to govern the disposal of CCR—to regulate CCR under Subtitle C or under Subtitle D of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. OSMRE correctly concluded that EPA would enforce Subtitle C CCR regulations at the FCPP if EPA selects this approach. <b>However, OSMRE has incorrectly assumed that there would be a regulatory gap if EPA decides to finalize Subtitle D. As described in the regulatory explanation provided in Attachment C to these comments, there would be no regulatory gap even if EPA finalizes Subtitle D regulations. EPA has made clear that Subtitle D regulations would be self-implementing—owners and operators of CCR landfills and surface impoundments would be required to comply with the rules without interaction with the regulatory agency.</b> APS requests that the final EIS reflect that there would be no regulatory gap, for the reasons described in Attachment C.</p>	See response to comment 276.003
276.037	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>APS requests that the final EIS incorporate the following clarification regarding hazardous air pollutant (HAP) metals emissions. While the Proposed Action will result in significant HAP metal emission reductions over historic levels, the percent reductions in the table comparing estimated historic and future HAP metals emissions require clarifications, as noted in Attachment A, the Technical Clarification Matrix at 4.</p> <p>The HAP metals Table 4.1-31 overstates the historic HAP metals emissions estimates and compares those historic overestimates to more precise post-2014 emissions estimates. This overstates the percent reduction of HAP metals emissions. More specifically, AP 42—the measurement used in the DEIS for historic emissions—over-predicts trace metals. However, the Mercury and Air Toxics Standard (MATS)44 limit, which was used as the point of comparison in the DEIS, is a more precise measurement of trace metals. In APS’s view, these two measurements do not provide a meaningful comparison, and EPRI emissions factors would be a better measurement for the historic HAP metals emissions. Using EPRI emissions factors for historic emissions, the post-2014 emissions will constitute a 37 percent reduction over 2000-2011 levels for all HAP metals, except mercury and selenium. This reduction is largely due to the shutdown of Units 1, 2 and 3 and partially due to MATS compliance on Units 4-5. Using the EPRI factors, post-2014 mercury emission estimates show a 67 percent reduction over 2000-2011 levels, and 2014 selenium emission estimates show a 79 percent reduction over 2000-2011 levels. There are greater percentage reductions in mercury and selenium because these metals are volatile, and Units 1, 2 and 3 removed them at different and lower rates as compared to Units 4 and 5. A chart incorporating the clarifications to the HAP metals table is attached as Attachment B.</p>	OSMRE maintains its original analysis but has also added the following text to the section: The Human Health Risk Assessment (AECOM 2013d) used EPRI emissions factors for calculating FCPP HAPS emission levels instead of AP-42 emissions factors. Use of EPRI emissions factors results in lower historic emissions and, therefore, a lower estimate of reductions compared to post-2014 emissions, as follows: a 37 percent reduction for all HAP metals (except mercury and selenium), a 67 percent reduction in mercury emission estimates, and a 79 percent reduction in selenium emission estimates over 2000-2011 levels. This reduction is largely due to the shutdown of Units 1, 2 and 3 and partially due to MATS compliance on Units 4-5. The use of the AP-42 emissions factors is appropriate and is consistent with other EIS analyses.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p><b>Importantly, while the HAP metals table in the DEIS overestimates percentage reductions, the emission estimates themselves support the DEIS’s findings regarding HAP metal emission impacts of the Proposed Action.</b> In fact, the emission estimates overstate the historic emission rates from Units 4 and 5. The Human Health Risk Assessment found that the FCPP emission levels are within levels protective of human health, and the Ecological Risk Assessments concluded that HQs exceeding 1 were due to current conditions—the future operation of the Project did not result in any HQs exceeding 1.</p> <p>APS recommends the use of EPRI emission factors for the HAP metals table because of the magnitude of overestimation that results from use of AP 42. However, APS believes that the use of AP 42 is generally a reasonable practice, and APS does not object to the use of AP 42 elsewhere in the DEIS in relation to pollutants that are emitted in smaller amounts. The use of AP 42 elsewhere in the DEIS provides accurate comparisons and adds to the conservatism of the analysis.</p>	
276.038	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>In addition to this detailed quantification of emissions, the DEIS also provides a qualitative assessment of climate change impacts (id. at 4.18-25), consistent with the draft guidance. <b>OSMRE’s conclusion that a qualitative assessment, rather than a quantitative assessment, of the cost of GHG emissions is appropriate for the analysis is consistent with the draft guidance, which does not suggest that cost needs to be quantified.</b> Additionally, quantification of the cost of GHG emissions would be speculative, since neither the FCPP nor Navajo Mine is subject to a carbon cap-and-trade regime. While there are several operational cap-and-trade programs in other regions and in the European Union, the auction price among existing cap-and-trade programs varies significantly and, therefore, is not a reliable means of estimating the cost of GHG emissions</p>	<p>A quantitative analysis of the social cost of carbon (SCC) has been added to the Final EIS in Section 4.2. The Draft EIS considered the SCC in a qualitative manner, but did not quantify the effects. Subsequent to issuance of the Draft EIS, CEQ published Draft Guidance on climate change analysis (CEQ 2014), in which CEQ indicates that emissions monetization is not required in every project-level NEPA analysis. Nonetheless, OSMRE determined that a quantitative analysis would be included in the Final EIS, following the Interagency Working Group Methods. The results of the SCC analysis do not change the conclusions or the findings of level of significance for the Climate Change issue; however, the analysis has been added to provide additional context to OSMRE’s decision.</p>
276.039	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>Finally, APS requests that the final EIS include a reference to EPA’s recently proposed regulation of CO2 emissions from existing fossil fuel-fired power plants under Clean Air Act In Section 111(d). After the publication of the DEIS, EPA proposed mandatory CO2 emission performance targets for each state. EPA estimates that, by 2030, those state targets will result in a 30 percent reduction in CO2 emissions compared to 2005 levels. President Obama has directed EPA to finalize that rulemaking by June 1, 2015. While it is impossible to predict whether EPA will determine that such a plan is necessary or appropriate for existing electric generating units located in Indian country and, if so, what that plan might require, EPA’s proposal provides important nationwide context for any climate change evaluation. <b>APS requests that OSMRE reference EPA’s recent proposal in the final EIS as Section 111(d) requirements may apply to the FCPP.</b></p>	<p>EPA recent proposal was included in the Air Quality section of the Final EIS.</p> <p>In June 2014, EPA issued the “Clean Power Plan” proposal to cut carbon pollution from existing power plants. The proposal establishes state-by-state goals to reduce greenhouse gases by 2030. The focus is on power plants, but states have discretion to meet goals with a combination of industries. The proposed regulation is subject to comment and finalization. Additionally, tribal lands are not given goals at this time. A proposed timetable is suggested for moving into the process with tribes, with July 2017 being when EPA would have a proposed goal for tribal lands. States are given a year to establish programs, with a provision for a 2-year extension; therefore, 2020 is when states are required to have a program in place. The tribes will likely lag that by a year or two, with the compliance timeframe lagging also. The EIS was changed to acknowledge the proposed plan; however, because of the uncertainties associated with whether the plan will be adopted or modified, and how it</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							would be implemented on the Navajo Nation, there is no change to the conclusions or analysis in the EIS.
276.040	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p><b>APS agrees with the DEIS’s conclusion that the Proposed Action would not cause major adverse earth resources impacts that would disproportionately affect environmental justice populations, DEIS at 4.11-16, and provides the following clarification with respect to the impacts of the Dry Fly Ash Disposal Areas (DFADAs).</b> The Proposed Action includes the creation of five new DFADAs to accommodate future disposal of fly ash from the FCPP. The DEIS evaluates an alternative ash disposal configuration that impacts fewer acres, Alternative D, which APS recommends that OSMRE select in addition to the Proposed Action, as explained in section VIII above. Although the DEIS finds that impacts to soil productivity from the DFADAs could potentially adversely affect the ability of Navajo Nation members to use this land for agricultural purposes in the future, id. at 4.11-16, <b>this region already faces substantial limitations on agricultural uses due to the arid desert climate. While these lands could potentially be used for grazing, they are unlikely to be used for other agricultural purposes, such as growing crops for food supply, because of the lack of available water for irrigation.</b> Furthermore, the record supports the DEIS’s conclusion that the overall Project impacts to soil productivity will be reduced from major to minor. As the DEIS properly notes, comprehensive revegetation plans are in place as part of the reclamation process for both the Navajo Mine Permit Area and Pinabete Permit Area to create a diverse and self-sustaining vegetation community. Id. at 4.6-17. <b>These reclamation efforts will increase the vegetation beyond the vegetation present before mining activities, creating a net benefit to the environmental justice communities that may use this land in the future.</b></p>	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.
276.041	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>Several environmental justice evaluations in the DEIS address the risks to environmental justice communities from the potential adverse impacts of ammonia sources other than urea at the FCPP. These risks include adverse impacts to water and Navajo Nation public service resources, in the event of an ammonia spill. DEIS at 4.11-18, 4-11.20. <b>APS again notes that its selection of urea as the FCPP’s ammonia source—the option recommended by OSMRE— eliminates the vast majority of these potential impacts.</b> The DEIS explains that because urea is transported as a solid, the potential risks during transportation and storage are greatly reduced compared to the risks for liquid ammonia. Since the on-site storage amount of ammonia generated from urea would be so small, OSMRE concludes that an accidental release of ammonia under the urea option would have only negligible to minimum impacts. Id. at 4.15-19. APS requests that APS’s selection of urea be reflected in the environmental justice evaluation of the final EIS and that the conclusion regarding impacts to water and Navajo Nation public service resources be updated accordingly.</p>	The ROD will reflect APS’ selection of the urea option. Any impact assessment (in environmental justice for example) that considers other options besides urea has been modified to reflect APS’ selection.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.042	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		APS notes that, since the Section 7 consultation had not formally commenced at the time the DEIS was published, some of the analysis regarding potential impacts to threatened and endangered species has likely evolved since that time. APS requests that all of the additions and adjustments to the species analysis that are incorporated into the final Biological Assessment submitted to FWS be incorporated into the final EIS	The EIS has been updated to be consistent with the findings of the Section 7 consultation.
276.043	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		Moreover, APS agrees that the applicant-proposed measures and best management practices highlighted in the DEIS are protective of biological resources and sensitive species. They include measures to ensure that species are protected throughout both construction activities and operation and maintenance. APS notes that, in addition to the measures listed in the DEIS, conservation measures were proposed in the Biological Assessment OSMRE prepared for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. <b>APS requests that the description of the conservation measures in the final EIS be revised to correspond to the final conservation measures included in the Biological Assessment.</b>	The EIS has been updated to be consistent with the findings of the Section 7 consultation.
276.044	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		The vast majority of the identification work and eligibility and effects determinations will be completed prior to the release of the final EIS. As illustrated by Appendix B to the DEIS, most of the eligibility determinations have already been made and are pending concurrence. See Appendix B.3 at Attachment C. APS requests that the final EIS be updated to reflect all completed eligibility and effects determinations.	Comment noted. Tables and the EIS have been updated based on the outcomes of consultation regarding determinations of eligibility.
276.045	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		The DEIS references an expansion of the transmission line ROW on the Hopi Reservation. See 4.4-17. This reference should be clarified, as there was not a ROW expansion; rather, the Hopi requested that the Area of Potential Effects be expanded 100 meters on either side of the ROW on the Hopi Reservation. APS recommends that the final EIS describe this expansion of the Area of Potential Effects on the Hopi Reservation in section 4.4.2.	Clarified last sentence in section 4.4.2.4 to read “Additional survey work for properties of religious and cultural significance (including TCPs) was conducted in the expanded APE, which covered 100 meters on either side of the ROW within the boundaries of the Hopi Reservation.”
276.046	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		As OSMRE has recognized and documented, PNM’s Four Corners to West Mesa line crosses Navajo individual-owned allotments. See Appendix B.3, p.4. The programmatic agreement includes procedures governing consultation on these allotments. Id. APS recommends that the final EIS include these allotments in Figures 1-1, 4.1-1, 4.4-3, 4.9-2, 4.10-1, 4.11-1, 4.16-1, 4.18-1.	Section 1.2 has been amended to include the following clarification: The West Mesa transmission line traverses Navajo Nation tribal trust lands up until the Reservation boundary and then passes through private and allotted trust lands held in trust by the U.S. Federal Government for individual Navajo tribal members.  Sections 4.9.2.1 and 4.12.2.2 have been amended similarly to clarify that the PNM 345kV West Mesa transmission line also crosses allotted lands that are held in trust by the U.S. Federal Government and administered by the Navajo Nation on behalf of individual Navajo members. Figure 4.9-2 (land use/ownership jurisdictions) has also been updated to show allotted lands.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							References referring to PNM's "Four Corners to West Mesa" and "Four Corners to San Juan Switchyard" have been corrected throughout the Draft EIS. OSMRE contends that all other references to the other land assignments are consistently and appropriately used.
276.047	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p><b>APS offers the following additional context related to background concentrations of constituents of potential concern.</b> This is an excerpt from the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine Energy Project Ecological Risk Assessment, October 2013, cited as AECOM 2013c in the DEIS, at 6-39:</p> <p>Many of the inorganic COPECs with HQs above 1 in the ERA are also found in non-impacted background locations. Background refers to constituents or locations that are not influenced by the releases from a site (e.g., the FCPP), and is usually described as naturally occurring or anthropogenic (USEPA 2002b). Shacklette and Boerngen (1984) summarized background concentrations of metals present in surficial soil samples collected at a depth of 20 cm across the United States between 1961 and 1975. These samples were collected to estimate ranges of these constituents in unaltered/minimally altered surficial materials.</p> <p>Table XIV-1 presents a comparison of the Current Conditions data for COPECs with HQs above 1 in the ERA against the range of concentrations identified by Shacklette and Boerngen (1984) for the western United States and the average of the New Mexico samples from that sampling effort (as summarized by USEPA [2007e]). These samples were collected many decades ago and are expected to represent naturally occurring levels of these metals in the soils. As indicated in the table, all of the Current Conditions concentrations fall within the range of observed concentrations for the western United States. All of the average concentrations from the Current Conditions data set are below the average of the New Mexico samples reported by Shacklette and Boerngen (1984), with the exception of selenium. However, the seven samples collected from within San Juan County had higher levels of selenium (average of 0.57 mg/kg) than the state average indicating that the region around the FCPP may have more elevated levels of naturally occurring selenium. The comparison in Table XIV-1 indicates that the risks due to Current Conditions in soil are similar to or below risks in background locations outside the influence of the FCPP and the Proposed Action.</p>	The discussion of these results in the DEIS makes it clear that the project-related effects are distinct from background level-effects.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.048	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		First, APS agrees that the Programmatic Agreement being prepared for the FCPP, transmission lines and ancillary facilities (“Programmatic Agreement”), pursuant to Section 106 will mitigate or avoid impacts on historic properties. The Programmatic Agreement will include a process for the applicants, agencies and consulting parties to determine and implement resource-specific measures to mitigate adverse effects on historic properties when it is not possible to avoid the resources. The Programmatic Agreement was listed in the DEIS as mitigation for the FCPP and transmission lines in the executive summary and at page 4.19-2. APS requests that the Programmatic Agreement be referenced as mitigation throughout the final EIS, where appropriate.	The PA has been referenced as appropriate in the Final EIS.
276.049	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		OSMRE has proposed mitigation measures for ash disposal. While the DEIS’s text is somewhat unclear, the DEIS suggests that the mitigation is meant to impose measures that EPA has proposed for regulating CCR under Subtitle D of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. DEIS at 4.19-31 (“[d]epending on the outcome of the EPA’s Final Rule, some or all of these measures may be requirements of EPA’s Final Rule on CCR”). EPA’s rule has not yet been finalized and OSMRE has incorrectly assumed that there would be a regulatory gap in CCR regulation at the FCPP if EPA finalizes a CCR Regulation under Subtitle D. See section VIII above and Attachment C. Therefore, APS understands the mitigation to mean that, in the absence of EPA regulation, OSMRE intends to impose the requirements of EPA’s proposed regulation as mitigation measures to ensure that they apply to the FCPP. As noted in Attachment C, a slight clarification in the text of OSMRE’s proposed mitigation measures is needed to ensure consistency with EPA’s proposal, as APS believes OSMRE intends. Provided APS’s understanding of OSMRE’s intention is correct, APS supports these mitigation measures for ash disposal, as clarified.	See response to comment 276.003
276.050	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		APS requests that OSMRE clarify that in addition to evaluating cumulative global emissions from China, the two ecological risk assessments (ERAs) cited in the DEIS also evaluated potential impacts from future emissions from regional emissions sources. Specifically, the ERAs took into account modeled future emissions from the existing Navajo Generating Station (assumed to continue operations through 2044, DEIS at 4.18-4) and the existing San Juan Generating Station (assumed in operation until 2074). The ERAs showed that for all metals and all ecological receptors evaluated in the ERAs, hazard quotients (HQs) exceeding 1 were entirely due to current conditions and that FCPP emissions associated with the 25-year Proposed Action did not result in any HQs greater than 1.52 Contributions to ecological risk from future FCPP operations under the Proposed Action would be negligible compared to current conditions. DEIS at 4.18-46. Thus, the DEIS incorporates extensive scientific analysis to conclude that the contribution of the FCPP to the potential cumulatively major effect of emissions deposition on aquatic resources would be significantly less	Clarification has been added to Section 4.18.3  Section 4.8 estimates ecological risks associated with the future operations of FCPP special status species, focusing those COPECs with HQs greater than one. For all COPECs and ecological receptors evaluated, HQs exceeding 1 were entirely due to current conditions; FCPP emissions associated with the proposed future 25-year project did not result in any HQs greater than 1, nor contribute appreciably to those risks already present under current conditions. These existing conditions are the result of geological conditions, anthropogenic sources other than the project facilities, as well as the historic operation of the FCPP. These findings do not mean that the FCPP will not contribute to ecological risk during the life of the proposed project, but they do indicate that such contributions would be negligible as compared to current conditions.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						than historic conditions and represents a decline over baseline emissions. Id. at 4.18-49.	
276.051	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		APS requests that OSMRE finalize the EIS and issue the Records of Decision in the first quarter of 2015. This timing is needed for SCR to be installed and operational on both Units 4 and 5 by July 31, 2018, as required for the FCPP to comply with the reductions mandated by EPA in the BART Federal Implementation Plan. See 77 Fed. Reg. 51620, 51621-22 (Aug. 24, 2012). Installation of SCR will require a multi-year planning, engineering, equipment procurement and construction process. In a recent Clean Air Act rulemaking, EPA assumed that 21 months would be needed to install SCR on a single unit, 76 Fed. Reg. 48208, 48282 (Aug. 8, 2011) (Cross-State Air Pollution Rule), and many argued that this underestimated the time needed to install SCR. However, APS will be constructing SCR on two units and will need to phase the construction on each unit, so that there are staggered outages. This will require careful planning to ensure that FCPP is able to provide needed baseload generation during the construction—it will also require more time than installing SCR on a single unit. APS and the FCPP co-owners cannot make the significant investment in this engineering, procurement and construction process until the Records of Decision are issued. Therefore, APS urges timely issuance decision documents.	OSMRE appreciates APS' request and is working with the cooperating agencies to complete the NEPA process in a timely manner. Many factors will determine the timing of these steps.
276.052	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		1. Global - As the DEIS correctly describes at 3-15 and 16, two DFADAs are already constructed and the Proposed Action and Alternative D contemplate the addition of up to 5 DFADAs (or connected cells). This should be stated consistently throughout the final EIS.	Comment noted.
276.053	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		2. Global (4.9, 4.10, 4.11, 4.15, 4.17, 4.18) - Update to reflect that APS selected urea as its ammonia source. See APS Narrative Comment Letter at 3 and 7.	The Final EIS has been modified to reflect urea choice.
276.054	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		3. Global (2.4.2.2, 4.9, 4.11, 4.15, 4.18) - Update to reflect that APS will be using dry sorbent injection on Units 4 and 5 to reduce H2SO4 emissions. See APS Narrative Comment Letter at 5.	The Final EIS has been modified to reflect urea choice.
276.055	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		4. Global (and 4.11), 4.11-36 - See APS Narrative Comment Letter at 17-18 regarding the covenant not to regulate.	The Final EIS has been reviewed for consistency throughout document on "covenant not to regulate" and determined that language is consistent. No change to text made.
276.056	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		5. Global - Update to consistently reference that BIA actions include both the approval of both right-of-way renewals and the lease extension for the FCPP plant area. See APS Narrative Comment Letter at 9.	Has been reviewed for consistency throughout document. Lease amendment #3 includes the ROW renewals.
276.057	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		6. Global - Update to consistently reference that BIA's rights-of-way approvals include Moenkopi Substation and ancillary facilities. See APS Narrative Comment Letter at 9.	Has been reviewed for consistency throughout document. Lease amendment #3 includes the ROW renewals.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.058	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		7. ES, 1, Table ES-2 and Table 1-1 - Remove the following item from the table of proposed actions (Table ES-2 and Table 1-1) listed for EPA: "Ensure that emissions from the FCPP comply with the Clean Air Act during modification of Title V Operating Permit and Title IV Acid Rain Permits." See APS Narrative Comment Letter at 9.	No change made
276.059	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		8. ES, pg xii, line 3 - APS and Hopi have reached agreement on the right-of-way renewal for the 500 kV transmission line and the renewal was submitted to the BIA Western Region office for review and agency action. See APS Narrative Comment Letter at 9.	Updated
276.060	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		9. ES, pg xix, line 3 - The FCPP switchyard and the transmission lines are also of a critical nature and should be described similarly to the Moenkopi switchyard in relation to importance to the grid.	The following sentence has been added to the discussion: "...Failure to renew the ROW for the Moenkopi and FCPP switchyards would potentially affect other existing transmission facilities that use the switchyards."
276.061	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		10. 1.0, pg 1-1, line 4 - Bullet 3 should be clarified to indicate that Lease Amendment #3 is for 25 years, rather than 40 years, as indicated in the DEIS.	Change made
276.062	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		11. 1.1.2, pg 1-3, line 1 - Clarify that APS has agreed to assume El Paso Electric's obligation to purchase seven percent of the coal supply for the FCPP rather than stating "APS will also be purchasing El Paso Electric's 7 percent ownership share."	Clarification made
276.063	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		12. Sec 1.2, 2.3, pgs 1-5, 1-7, 2-28, Figure 1-1 and Figure 1-2 - As the DEIS notes (at 4.8-29), the FCPP to Cholla Substation transmission line ROW runs parallel in a 315' ROW corridor for 85.1 miles, then separates into two, 195' corridors for just over 40 miles and then converges into a single 315' corridor for 10.7 miles before leaving the Navajo Nation. The text in section 1 and section 2.3, as well as the figures, should be updated to indicate and show the split in the 345kV transmission lines.	This is not stated on page 4.8-29 of the Draft EIS. It has been determined that the adjacent ROW would not be visible at the scale drawn. The FCPP to Cholla Substation transmission line consists of two parallel transmission lines that occupy the same ROW for approximately 85 miles before separating into two ROWs for another 40 miles and converging into a single right-of-way for 10 miles before leaving the Navajo Nation".
276.064	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		13. Sec 1.3, pg 1-10, 1-11, Table 1-1; line 4 - APS FCPP to Moenkopi transmission line approval or disapproval is by BIA not BLM. BLM does not have jurisdiction to approve the FCPP to Moenkopi line as the ROW is entirely on Navajo Nation or Hopi Tribe land.	Change made.
276.065	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		14. Sec 1.4, pgs 1-10, 1-12, Table 1-1 - EPA actions listed in Table 1-1 for the FCPP are not subject to NEPA because they are Clean Air Act actions. They should either be deleted, or the table should be updated to reflect that EPA is also issuing a PSD permit for FCPP (also exempt from NEPA). The reference to the Navajo Nation Clean Water Act 401 certification should also be removed, for the reasons described in Section IV of APS's comment letter.	The text above the table states that some of the actions in the table require NEPA review, not that all do. Clear Air Actions have been left in place. Navajo Nation CWA 401 Certification for FCPP removed.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.066	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>15. Sec 2.2.7 - In 2012, APS installed an auxiliary boiler needed to provide steam for Units 4-5 start-up. Previously, Units 1-2-3 provided start-up steam for Units 4-5.</p> <p>(The auxiliary boiler is included in the latest version of the NAAQS modeling report.)</p>	The following sentence has been added to Section 2.2.3: In 2012, APS installed an auxiliary boiler to provide steam for Units 4 and 5 following the shut-down of Units 1, 2, and 3.
276.067	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>16. Sec 2.3.1, pg 2-32 - The level of description should be consistent with that of PNM's transmission lines on page 2-33. Therefore, replace section On Going Maintenance Activities with:</p> <p>"APS conducts yearly inspections of each structure on each transmission line and conducts maintenance as needed. Visual and physical inspections may include vehicle (passenger and all-terrain vehicle), pedestrian, and aerial surveys. APS performs climbing inspections every 7 years, which involve a close visual inspection of each transmission line. During ground surveys, inspectors utilize existing access roads. These access roads are maintained by the local landowner for the APS ROWs and APS does not conduct regular road maintenance activities. Access roads are primarily unimproved two-track dirt roads. Access roads are repaired when they become impassable for maintenance activities. Access roads may also be managed to control erosion and reduce conditions that cause excessive rutting. Maintenance for the transmission line structures may include re-leveling pads in areas of uneven terrain to permit safe equipment setup, repair, replacement, or addition of structures or any of the associated equipment and wires, and treating the structures to prevent rot and extend their life span. APS has an environmental screening program that requires screening transmission maintenance work for compliance-related environmental issues. The environmental review relies on biological and cultural surveys of the ROW corridors. Ground-disturbing work in the vicinity of a known cultural or biological resource requires specific monitoring or avoidance stipulations and procedures, and land management agencies are consulted to determine the best course of action to protect the integrity of the resource while conducting the necessary maintenance. Emergency conditions (e.g., weather, system outages, and structure damage) are addressed immediately. Vegetation management at APS involves the cyclical treatment of vegetation approximately every 5 to 10 years utilizing mechanical, manual, and herbicide treatments. Vegetation may be cleared within the entire permitted ROW width, including clearing around poles, guy wires, anchors and towers. On rare occasions vegetation maintenance outside the routine cycle is required to address emergencies or imminent threats to the transmission line's performance. Vegetation maintenance activities are conducted with attention to resource (cultural) and plant and animal species concerns. APS conducts aerial helicopter patrols of the transmission lines 1 to 3 times per year to identify potential problem areas, to plan maintenance schedules and to monitor effectiveness of treatment. Ground patrols may be required to follow up on any identified problem areas."</p>	It doesn't appear that there is anything factually incorrect as currently written in the DEIS, therefore, change not made.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.068	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>17. Sec 3.2.4.2, pg 3-27, line 4 - Recommend editing this section as follows:</p> <p>“Under this alternative, BIA would approve the amended lease for the FCPP, and the plant would continue to operate as described under the Proposed Action. However, instead of constructing seven separate, stand-alone DFADAs, APS would construct a single “super cell” DFADA, made up of multiple, connected cells that would be approximately 350 acres total (Figure 3-5). Construction of a single large DFADA would eliminate the number of impoundment walls and roads through the CCR area. The site would still be constructed in phases. As each subsequent site is constructed cell nears capacity, the liner and leachate collection system would be extended such that the sites would act as a single facility. Dry ash, with enough water added for dust control and compaction, will be trucked to the DFADA. Since the DFADA will not be an impoundment, there will be no risk of dam failure or flow of ash slurry offsite to Chaco Wash. The DFADA would be setback at least 300 feet from the FCPP Lease Area boundary. The proposed borrow areas would remain as described in the Proposed Action and would be located in the area of future expansion of the super cell; therefore, the potential reduction in ground disturbance resulting from the DFADA would not be realized during excavation of the borrow pits.”</p>	Does not change the description functionally. No change has been made.
276.069	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		18. Sec 3.2.6.1, pg 3-35 - Ash is sprayed with water and/or chemical stabilizers for dust control.	See response to comment 276.069
276.070	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		19. Sec 3.2.6.7, pgs 3-40 and 41 - Measures labeled “Common to All Project Components” should be deleted. They were not proposed by applicants.	The applicant proposed measures have been revised to be consistent with the BA.
276.071	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		20. Sec 3.2.6.8, pg 3-44, line 1-5 - Request that the conservation measures included in the final EIS be consistent with the final Biological Assessment and replace the measures listed here. It is not possible for APS to avoid all potential work in this area for 6 months. APS will avoid/minimize potential impacts but the area cannot be “off limits” for emergency work, which is necessary to ensure safety and reliability.	The APM have been made consistent with the BA.
276.072	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		21. Sec 3.3.1.4 and ES, Tables ES-3 and 3-1 - Tables ES-3 and 3-1 should be updated for consistency with the text in section 3.3.	Tables reviewed for consistency

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.073	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		22. Sec 3.3.4.2, 3.3.4.3, pg 3-53, lines 3, 4 - Revise to state that the FCPP lease and transmission line ROWs would be renewed under this alternative.	The text in Section 3.3.4.2 has been revised as follows:  Under this alternative, the amended lease for the FCPP would be renewed, and the current lease would expire in 2016 in conjunction with the expiration of the Navajo Mine SMCRA permit. However, under this alternative the Navajo Mine may not be able to meet contractual obligations through 2041. After coal reserves are exhausted and/or the SMCRA permit expires, APS would shut down Units 4 and 5.  3.3.4.3 Transmission Lines  Under this alternative, the ROWs for the four subject transmission lines would not be approved, as described for Alternative A. As the subject lines primarily transmit power from the FCPP, under this alternative the power source for the transmission lines would be removed. The lines would either be decommissioned and dismantled or left in place, as described for the No Action Alternative.
276.074	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		23. Sec 4.1, pg 4.1-1, line 1 - The EIS should clarify the reasons a 300-km radius was used for the Proposed Action area, including that this is consistent with EPA's area evaluated for the BART rule and for the technical reasons explained in the Deposition Area Ecological Risk Assessment.	Clarification added
276.075	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		24. Sec 4.1.1., pg 4.1-2, line 3 - Revise the phrase "The greatest" source to "An important" source. In some situations, high NOx and VOC emissions are not the result of fossil fuel combustion alone.	The change was made as suggested.
276.076	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		25. Sec 4.1 - The DEIS correctly states that the FCPP emits ozone precursors, VOCs and NOx. The FCPP does not emit ozone. In several places the DEIS references ozone emissions from the FCPP. Clarify references to ozone emissions in the Air Quality section to refer to emissions of ozone precursors.	The following clarification was added: Ozone is not directly emitted, rather, its precursors NOx and VOC are the pollutants which react with sunlight to form ground-level photochemical ozone and contribute to regional haze, along with SO2 and particulate matter. Criteria emissions – also referred to as regulated pollutants – caused by the Action include reactive or volatile organic compounds (ROCs or VOCs), nitrogen oxides (NOx as NO and NO2), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO2), respirable particulate matter (PM10), and fine particulate matter (PM2.5).
276.077	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		26. Sec 4.1.1.6, pg 4.1-15, line 2 - The Part 71 permit expired on August 1, 2013. The application for renewal was timely filed in January 2013.	Text was revised as follows: The current Part 71 permit for FCPP (NN-ROP-05-07) expired August 1, 2013; however, FCPP submitted a permit renewal application on January 25, 2013. FCPP may operate according to their present permit terms and conditions until NNEPA either issues a new permit or denies their renewal application.
276.078	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		27. Sec 4.1.2.2, pg 4.1-17 - The list of sources affecting regional air quality should include general wind-blown dust, especially in the spring, as a major factor in the entire region. Also, the most severe cases of visibility impairment (other than the episodic dust storm events) occur as a result of forest fire (either wildfire events or as a result of planned	"wind-blown dust and forest fires" has been added to the sentence.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						burns) and smoke from fires as far away as Arizona or California can impact visibility and air quality in the Four Corners region.	
276.079	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		28. Sec 4.1.2.2, pg 4.1-21, Figure 4.1-2 - Revise the legend label for Monitoring Stations in Figure 4.1-2 to say "Monitoring Stations, Four Corners Region". There are many more monitoring stations within the 300 km region.	Change made
276.080	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		29. Sec 4.1.2.3, pg 4.1-26, line 2 - The Unit 4-5 FGD absorber system went into service in 1985. In 2004-2005 APS undertook a voluntary trial to increase sulfur dioxide removal. Other references to FGD should be updated accordingly.	Changes were made as suggested.
276.081	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		30. Sec 4.1.3.2, pg 4.1-69, Table 4.1-31 - See APS comment letter at section IX for clarification regarding Table 4.1-31. An updated table is provided as Attachment B. Text relying upon the table should be updated accordingly.	The Attachment B Estimated Historic and Future HAP Metals Emissions were not used to update Table 4.1-31. The more conservative percent reduction conclusions based on use of the alternative EPRI emissions factors from the HHRA were added to the text where Table 4.1-31 is introduced. The AP-42 analysis is appropriate and is consistent with other analyses in the EIS (see also, response to comment 307.073). The updated text does not affect the conclusions in the Final EIS.
276.082	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		31. Sec 4.1.3.3, pg 4.1-71, line 2 - The ozone concentrations that appear on these tables represent the contribution from the VOC and NOx emissions from all sources in the region including those from the FCPP, but not only the FCPP as implied in the current paragraph. Change "An assessment of ozone emissions from the FCPP was conducted ..." to "A regional assessment of ozone concentrations was conducted...". Additionally for Table 4.1-33 change "Historic Ozone" to "2005 Ozone" and "Baseline Ozone" to 2018 Proposed Action Ozone.	Change made
276.083	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		32. Sec 4.1.4, pg 4.1-74 - The references in the last two paragraphs on this page should be AECOM 2013a and AECOM 2013b.	Change made
276.084	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		33. Sec 4.1.4 - pg 4.1-76, line 5 - Edit to last sentence "Thus, the results are somewhat uncertain, but provide an upper bound to the impacts (i.e., impacts are more likely to be over-estimated than under-estimated)."	Change not made. The statement is clear as written.
276.085	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		34. Sec 4.1.4, pg 4.1-79 to 4.1-80 - Remove the sentence "Over time, it dries into a cement-like solid." The ash produced by the FCPP does not harden as such.	Change made. Checked for reference to this throughout document.
276.086	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		35. Sec 4.1.4, pg 4.1-85, Table 4.1-41 - The modeling results in this Table 4.1-41 should be updated to reflect the revised AECOM NAAQS modeling report provided in Feb. 2014 with the higher 1-hour NO2 emission rates and inclusion of the auxiliary boiler in the modeling.	Values in Table 4.1-41 were updated with values from the revised NAAQS Modelling Report (Table 5-1), received on August 26, 2014. The report included revisions that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporate a re-run, using the latest release of AERMOD.</li> <li>• Incorporate urea and Dry Sorbent Injection (DSI) handling to be consistent with the associated PSD permit application.</li> </ul>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include coal, overburden, and topsoil stockpile locations within the proposed Pinabete mine area.</li> </ul> <p>The minor refinements produced very little change in modeled values and did not change the conclusion that the project would not cause exceedance of the NAAQS.</p>
276.087	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>36. Sec 4.1.4 - pg 4.1-81 &amp; 4.1-99 - In the discussions about plume visibility, it should be clarified that the plume visibility analysis was conducted by AECOM for areas within 50 km, within which there are no PSD Class I areas. The last sentence on page 4.1-81 should be edited as follows: “No criteria exist for evaluating visible plumes from sources beyond the boundaries of Federal Class I areas; therefore, this criteria was used to determine if emissions from the Proposed Action would affect visibility within <del>Class I</del> Class II areas.”</p> <p>The EIS should note the results of the plume visibility analysis, which indicate that since continued operations, with the shutdown of Units 1-3 and installation of SCR on Units 4 and 5, will result in a large reduction in PM and NOx, this will result in a net improvement in plume visibility. The plume visibility due to FCPP emissions will noticeably improve for most of the analyzed vistas, while others will have imperceptible changes in visibility.</p>	<p>The sentence was changed to reflect the criterion was applied within a 50 km radius, even though no Class I areas exist within the radius.</p> <p>The plume visibility analysis was conducted from 16 areas within the 50 km radius. The results of the analyses are shown in the “Plume Visibility Assessment Summary” sub-sections of each Alternative section. These sub-sections address the second part of this comment by giving specific results. Tables 4.1-49 and 4.1-50 summarize the screening-level results in terms of the vistas with greatest change, the least change as a percent of significance threshold for each parameter, and the number of vistas for which the visibility parameters would be improved or be degraded.</p>
276.088	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>37. Sec 4.1.4, pg 4.1-75, line 3 - Update to reflect that the modeling was rerun with the new version of AERMOD and the results were submitted to OSMRE; the conclusions of the modeling remain the same.</p>	<p>At the time the DEIS was developed, the Applicants’ air quality modeling was on hold, pending the USEPA approval of needed changes to the AERMET/AERMOD model. The EPA issued an approved model, which was used to update the analysis. The updated analysis is presented in the Final EIS. Minor changes were made to the model results, which do not change the conclusions presented in the DEIS.</p>
276.089	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>38. Sec 4.1.4.5, pg 4.1-103, line 8 - Change “Ozone emissions” to “VOC and NOx emissions”.</p>	<p>The comment is correct, in that ozone is not directly emitted, rather, its precursors NOx and VOC emitted, and these “ozone precursors” react with sunlight to form ground-level photochemical ozone and contribute to regional haze, along with SO2 and particulate matter. This occurrence and 4 other occurrences of “ozone emissions” in the DEIS were changed to “ozone precursor emissions” in the FEIS.</p>
276.090	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>39. Sec 4.3.4, pg 4.3-14 - line 3 - “At the FCPP, these activities would include the excavation of soils for the construction of berms around the DFADAs.” The construction of the stormwater berms will have minimal impact on paleontological resources, but the excavation and construction of the ash disposal cells will result in ground disturbance.</p>	<p>Sentence changed as follows: At the FCPP, these activities would include <u>the excavation and construction of DFADA cells</u> as well as excavation of soils for the construction of berms around the DFADAs.</p>
276.091	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>40. Sec 4.3.4.1, pg 4.3-20, line 1 - Clarify that no impoundments will be constructed, since the FCPP will be disposing of CCR through dry ash disposal methods. Clarify that berms may be constructed to minimize runoff and to divert surface water runoff from entering the disposal facilities (run-on).</p>	<p>Text changed as follows: The soil needed to create the berms for stormwater control as well as evapotranspiration covers for closed DFADA cells would be borrowed from areas inside the existing FCPP Lease Area.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.092	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		41. Sec 4.3.4.1, pg 4.3-23, line 1 - While the roads used to access the transmission line ROWs may be paved (unlikely in all cases, however) not all roads along transmission lines that are used to inspect and maintain the lines and ROW are paved. There should be some mention of potential erosion, acknowledged to be minimal, due to travel on unpaved roads and maintenance operations.	Sentence changed as follows: Most vehicle access to the transmission lines is via paved roadways; however, some occurs on unpaved roadways. Minor erosion and soil disturbance would result from vehicle traffic on unpaved roadways. Implementation of applicant proposed measures would minimize any potential for erosion or soil disturbance.
276.093	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		42. Sec 4.3.4.1, pg 4.3-23, line 2 - While no new towers are proposed, it may be a good idea to mention that emergency tower replacements can occur and that proper consideration for offsite erosion and sedimentation and adverse impacts to paleontological resources, while possible, would be unlikely due to APS' and PNM's management practices.	Clarification not necessary here, no change made.
276.094	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		43. Sec 4.3.4.4, pg 4.3-27, line 2 - Impacts to topography, soils, and geology would be less under Alternative D than under the Proposed Action due to the smaller acreage of disturbance.	This is clear as written, no change made.
276.095	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		44. Sec 4.3.4.5, pg 4.3-28, line 2 - Under the No Action Alternative, there would be surface disturbance due to reclamation of the power plant facilities and ash disposal area, so there would be impacts to soils, but not likely any to topography, geology, or minerals.	Text has been revised as follows: Soil disturbance would occur during reclamation of the decommissioned facilities and ash disposal area. This would be a short-term minor impact. Reclamation activities would not impact topography, geology, or mineral resources within the area of the FCPP.
276.096	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>45. Sec 4.4 - See APS Narrative Comment Letter at 30-32 for suggested additions.</p> <p>APS requests that the final EIS include the following clarifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The vast majority of the identification work and eligibility and effects determinations will be completed prior to the release of the final EIS. As illustrated by Appendix B to the DEIS, most of the eligibility determinations have already been made and are pending concurrence. See Appendix B.3 at Attachment C. APS requests that the final EIS be updated to reflect all completed eligibility and effects determinations.</li> </ul> <p>C The DEIS references an expansion of the transmission line ROW on the Hopi Reservation. See 4.4-17. This reference should be clarified, as there was not a ROW expansion; rather the Hopi requested that the APE be expanded 100 meters on either side of the ROW on the Hopi Reservation. APS recommends that the final EIS describe this expansion of the APE on the Hopi Reservation in Section 4.4.2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As OSMRE has recognized and document, PNM's FC to West Mesa line crosses Navajo individual-owned allotments. See Appendix B.3, p. 4. The PA includes precedures governing consultation on these allotments. Is. APS recommends that the final EIS include these allotments in Figures 1-1, 4.1-1, 4.4-3, 4.9-2, 4.10-1, 4.11-1, 4.16-1, 4.18-1.</li> </ul>	Please see responses to Comments 276.044-046

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.097	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		46. Sec 4.4.1.1, pg 4.4-2, line 1 - The NHPA places particular emphasis on federal agency consultation with THPOs and tribes. The last sentence of this paragraph should include tribes in the list of groups with which the lead federal agency has an obligation to work.	Comment noted. No change made. This is a general discussion on regulatory compliance.
276.098	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		47. Sec 4.4.1.2, pg 4.4-4, line 2 - It should be pointed out that NM regulations do not apply on tribal lands. Per a NM DCA report: "Tribal statutes and regulations cover all activities that are carried out within the sovereign boundaries of individual reservations. On non-federal and non-tribal lands, OAS [Office of Archaeological Studies] activities are covered by the provisions of the Cultural Properties Act and the Unmarked Burial Statute."	The Final EIS has been revised such that the 2nd and 3rd sentence of 2nd paragraph under 4.4.1.2 are revised to read "This act authorizes the committee to issue permits for archaeological survey and excavation and excavation of unmarked human burials on state and private lands to qualified institutions with the concurrence of the state archaeologist and SHPO. It also established civil and criminal penalties for looting of archaeological sites and disturbance of unmarked burials on state and private lands."
276.099	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		48. Sec 4.4.2.2, pg 4.4-15, line 3 - The Unruh and Vierra 2012 report identified 20 sites, 13 previously recorded (6 of which were not relocated), and one newly recorded. 9 sites were recommended as NRHP eligible. This information related to eligibility recommendations could be incorporated into the discussion even though the final determinations by the THPO and OSMRE have not been made, as a way to present a clearer picture of potential impacts.	Comment noted. Consultation regarding determinations of eligibility and project effects is ongoing. The EIS will be updated accordingly. Report recommendations made by the applicant will not be added to the EIS.
276.100	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		49. Sec 4.4.2.2, pg 4.4-15, line 6 - This paragraph only includes the sites along the APS ROW to the Moenkopi Substation, but not the 6 sites along the ROW between Moenkopi and the Navajo Nation border. These sites should be referenced in the final EIS and either the applicant's eligibility recommendations for these sites or the eligibility determinations (if completed) should be included in the final EIS.	Appendix B lists all the sites located within the APE. Consultation regarding determinations of eligibility and project effects is ongoing. The EIS will be updated accordingly. Report recommendations made by the applicant will not be added to the EIS.
276.101	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		50. Sec 4.4.2.2, pg 4.4-15, line 7 - There are 2 345-kV lines but the APE only extends to the border of the Navajo Nation, not all the way to Cholla. The total number of recorded sites (79) is correct for the ROW to the Navajo Nation border. 66 of these recorded sites were identified as NRHP-eligible.	Change text to read "to the Navajo Nation border on the Cholla line".
276.102	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		51. Sec 4.4.2.2, pg 4.4-16, line 3 - The Olson 1971 project was an aerial reconnaissance survey only in Arizona, not a salvage project. 62 sites were identified in this part of the 345-kV ROW, but none were NRHP-eligible.  The NM portion of the ROW was surveyed using helicopter and ground reconnaissance and reported in Siscenti 1962. In preparation for construction of the transmission line structures, 3 sites in this part of the ROW were excavated because they were NRHP-eligible.	Comment noted. The Olson 1971 report cited in the EIS consists of salvage work completed at 29 sites.  Revised text to read 'In addition to these recent surveys, an archaeological salvage project was conducted for the APS 345-kV power line <b>within Arizona</b> in the 1960s (Olson 1971). The salvage project identified 29 archaeological sites.'

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.103	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		52. Sec 4.4.2.3, pg 4.4-16, line 7 - There are no designated timeframes or treatments for removal of historic structures from service. APS must consult with the Navajo Nation before determining if the structures (including Morgan Lake Dam) will be demolished, left intact, or modified before they revert back to Navajo ownership.	Comment noted. OSMRE is currently consulting with the NNTHPO regarding determinations of eligibility and project effects. The treatment of historic structures is outlined in the PA.
276.104	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		53. Sec 4.4.2.4, pg 4.4-17, line 6 - The last sentence in this paragraph mentions an expansion of the ROW within the Hopi Reservation. While the APE was expanded, the APS ROW was not expanded.	Clarified
276.105	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		54. Sec 4.4.4, pg 4.4-18, line 2 - Effects from project alternatives would only be considered if there is an impact to NRHP-eligible historic properties. Recommend changing sentence to read "The criteria listed below were considered when evaluating the types of short-term and long-term effects the Project alternatives could have on the <u>NRHP-eligible</u> historic properties within the APE." The importance of impacts to eligible properties should also be clarified in the last paragraph on this page.	Clarification made.
276.106	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		55. Sec 4.4.4, pg 4.4-19, Table 4.4-3 - This table only includes the recorded sites for the ash disposal area. The information from the rest of the FCPP lease area should be included or the title should make it clear that the full lease area is not included.	Change made
276.107	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		56. Sec 4.4.4, pg 4.4-20, Table 4.4-4 - The numbers presented in this table should be updated to correspond with the numbers of recorded sites along the APS and PNM transmission lines already presented in the previous sections.	Change made
276.108	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		57. Sec 4.4.4.1, pg 4.4-20 - 25, line 2 and Table 4.4-5 and Table 4.4-6 - The text should be revised to state that "Table 4.4-5 lists the archaeological historic properties present within the APE for the Pinabete Permit Area under Alternative A." A corresponding change should be made to the table's title, and to the title of Table 4.4-6.	Change made
276.109	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		58. Sec 4.5.1.1, pg 4.4-2, line 1 - Delete "combined waste treatment pond" from the sentence that says "no discharge was released from the chemical metal cleaning water or combined waste treatment pond." There was discharge from the combined waste treatment pond.	Change made
276.110	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		59. Sec 4.5.2.1, pg 4.5-17 - The DEIS erroneously states that all monitoring wells at FCPP "exceeded the New Mexico and EPA drinking water standard for boron (0.75 mg/L)." Neither EPA nor New Mexico has established a drinking water standard for boron. The correct information is provided in Table 4.5-6 on page 4.5-20. The table provides a summary of groundwater quality monitoring results from FCPP and compares the results to drinking water standards adopted by EPA and NNEPA. In this table, boron is listed under the category of Constituents	Changed text to state that "All monitoring wells at the FCPP, including those that would represent "background" or pre-power plant levels have relatively high boron concentrations (greater than the State of New Mexico surface water standard of 0.75 mg/L) at various times during the period of record (1987-2012) (APS 2013)."

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						with No Applicable Drinking Water Standards. A footnote to the table explains that the NNEPA standards are surface water quality standards, not groundwater standards.	
276.111	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		60. Sec 4.5.2.2, pg 4.5-33, line 3 - In the first sentence replace “that would be constructed to capture” with “that captures.”  The Lined Ash Impoundment is currently in use.	Change made
276.112	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		61. Sec 4.5.2.2, pg 4.5-34, line 3 - Replace this paragraph with: Water is pumped from the San Juan River to Morgan Lake. Water from Morgan Lake is pumped into the FCPP for the main uses of heat transfer in the primary cooling systems, steam production in the turbine systems, use in SO2 scrubbers, and as cooling water for the condenser cooling system. Oil-free power plant wastewater is drained to the circulating water discharge canal and released back into Morgan Lake. Condenser cooling water is discharged into Morgan Lake at around 40.5°C (105° F). Water from Morgan Lake is released via No Name Wash into Chaco Wash, which flows back into the San Juan River.	There are no inaccuracies as written, and suggested language does not provide necessary clarification. No change made.
276.113	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		62. Sec 4.5.2.2, pg 4.5-33; 4.5-36, line 5 to 6 (4.5-33); and Figure 4.5-8 - Navajo Nation Water Quality Standards do not apply to Morgan Lake.	Added the following sentence to the front of the paragraph: “No tribal, state, or federal water quality standards apply to discharges from FCPP or water quality in Morgan Lake; comparison to NNEPA standards is for context only.”
276.114	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		63. Sec 4.5.4, pg 4.5-41, first bullet - The criteria for “Major” adverse impacts should clarify that major adverse impacts are “outside the random fluctuations of natural processes.”	Clarification made
276.115	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		64. Sec 4.5.4.1, pg 4.5-46, Surface Water Quality, 2nd paragraph - Reference should be to Table 4.5-12.	Change made
276.116	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		65. Sec 4.5.4.1, pg 4.5-57, line 3 - In the first sentence, change “beneath” to “in.”	Change made
276.117	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		66. Sec 4.5.4.1, pg 4.5-57, line 3 - In the second to last sentence, change “is in the process of installing” to “has installed.”	Change made
276.118	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		67. Sec 4.5.4.1, pg 4.5-58, line 3 - Replace paragraph starting “Similar to the existing...” with: “In the ash disposal area, BMPs such as silt fences, berms, and settling basins are and will be utilized for stormwater. Therefore, no adverse impacts to water quality would result from stormwater runoff associated with the proposed new DFADA sites.”	Clarification added
276.119	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		68. Sec 4.5.4.1, pg 4.5-59, line 1 - Suggest a cross-reference to the Air Quality section, which addresses future emissions from the Proposed Action and the alternatives, including the No Action alternative, in Section 4.1.4.	The last sentence of page 4.5-58 of the draft EIS refers the reader to Section 4.1, Air Quality. No change made.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.120	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		69. Sec 4.5.4.5, pg 4.5-63, line 6 - Clarify that with the shutdown of the FCPP, air emissions from the FCPP would cease, but the deposition of mercury, selenium, and other pollutants from other sources would still continue.	The Draft EIS states “from FCPP” already. No change made.
276.121	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		70. Sec 4.5.4.5, pg 4.5-63, line 6 - In the last sentence under the FCPP section replace the word “current” with “historic” and delete “other facilities.”  “With regard to groundwater, since the historic ash ponds would remain in place and the DFADAs are lined, impacts would be similar as described for the Proposed Action.”	Clarification made
276.122	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		71. Sec 4.5.4.1, pg 4.5-58, line 7 -Replace EPRI in the last sentence with AECOM.	Have deleted “by EPRI”
276.123	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		72. Sec 4.6.4, pg 4.6-14, line 2 - Add footnote after “combustion of coal at the FCPP” - “The scope of the ERAs is limited to evaluating the FCPP stack emissions because the proposed operations at the mine site would not emit the COPECs in sufficient magnitude to be considered in the ERA.”	The following footnote has been added to the Final EIS: “The scope of the ERA was limited to the FCPP stack emissions because the proposed operations at the mine site would not result in atmospheric emissions of COPECs of sufficient magnitude to cause adverse environmental effects. The potential effects of runoff from the mine are considered outside of the ERA”
276.124	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		73. Sec 4.6.4, pg 4.6-14, line 2 - Edit beginning of 2nd sentence “One ERA was conducted to evaluate ecological risks to both...”	Suggested edits were made
276.125	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		74. Sec 4.6.4, pg 4.6-14, line 2 - Provide a figure showing the boundary of the Deposition Area, as shown in Figure 2-1 of the ERA for the Deposition Area (AECOM 2013 c).	The Deposition Area has been added to figure 4.1-4.
276.126	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		75. Sec 4.6.4, pg 4.6-14, line 2 - Edit sentence beginning with “The other ERA...” to “The second ERA was conducted to evaluate ecological risks associated with current conditions and future FCPP emissions as well as future regional and global emissions for...”	Suggested edits were made
276.127	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		76. Sec 4.6.4, pg 4.6-14, line 3 - Add the following text to the end of the 3rd paragraph: “The ERA process is used to inform environmental decision making by evaluating the potential for adverse ecological effects that may occur as a result of exposure to one or more environmental stressors. The approach used in the ERAs for evaluating the potential impacts of the Proposed Action is consistent with the USEPA’s Guidelines for Ecological Risk Assessment (USEPA 1998a), Ecological Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund: Process for Designing and Conducting Ecological Risk Assessments (USEPA 1997), and the Screening Level Ecological Risk Assessment Protocol for Hazardous Waste Combustion Facilities (SLERAP; USEPA 1999). The tiered approach for risk assessment recommended by the USEPA (1997, 1998a) has been adopted in these ERAs. Consistent with the SLERAP (USEPA 1999), a conservative screening level evaluation was conducted first	Suggested edits were made

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						using maximum media concentrations and conservative assumptions. A more refined evaluation was conducted for receptors and scenarios that indicated potential risks in the screening level evaluation.”	
276.128	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		77. Sec 4.6.4, pg 4.6-14, line 4 - Delete water from list of site-specific media sampled. Change text to “collection of project specific soil and sediment samples...”	Suggested edits were made
276.129	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		78. Sec 4.6.4, pg 4.6-14, line 4 - Add text noting number of soil sampling locations “Project specific samples were collected from 35 locations representing different soil...”	Suggested edits were made
276.130	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		79. Sec 4.6.4, pg 4.6-15, line 1 - The San Juan River ERA does not describe the AERMOD modeling conducted by AECOM. Change the second sentence to read “The air dispersion and deposition modeling conducted by AECOM is described in the Deposition Area ERA (AECOM 2013a).”	Suggested edits were made
276.131	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		80. Sec 4.6.4, pg 4.6-15, line 5 - Add after the first sentence: “It is generally assumed that as the number of affected individuals increases, the likelihood of population-level effects also increases. However, effects on individual organisms may occur with little or no population or community-level effects.”	Suggested edits were made
276.132	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		81. Sec 4.6.4, pg 4.6-15, line 5 - Add to the end of the sentence that begins “Thus, potential ...” “...and therefore the analysis presented here is considered conservative vis-à-vis population risk.”	The following text was added in Section 4.6.2: Thus, potential risks to individuals are likely not representative of risks to populations; in general, for the same exposures, population risk tends to be lower than individual risk and therefore the analysis presented here is considered conservative with regard to its’ assessment of risks to populations.
276.133	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		82. Sec 4.6.4.1, pg 4.6-19, lines 3-5 - Suggest adding impact analysis of current vegetation management practices within the APS transmission line ROWs. Section 4.17.2 (page 4.17-17) provides a summary of what could be placed here.  Note, it would also be appropriate to present this information in Section 2.3.1 to be consistent with the Vegetation Management activities presented for PNM lines (Section 2.3.2).	The following text was added to the Transmission Line Discussion in 4.6.4.1: “APS and PNM manage vegetation within the transmission line ROWs to prevent this vegetation from interfering with the transmission lines and to maintain access to the lines for conducting maintenance. These activities are conducted in accordance with each company’s vegetation management program, and are subject to their environmental screening programs and additional measures to protect avian species and special status plants within the ROW (see Section 3.2.6). Vegetation management in any given area occurs every 2 to 5 years, depending on growth rates and would keep the vegetative communities within the ROWs in a similar condition to the environmental baseline.”
276.134	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		83. Sec 4.7.2.2, pg 4.7-7, Table 4.7-1 - Add Swainson’s hawk. Source: Mikesic, D.G. 2008. Species Account for Non-Endangered Raptors & Migratory Birds. Website: <a href="http://nnhp.nndfw.org">http://nnhp.nndfw.org</a> . Revised: 17 MAR 2008.	Swainson’s hawk was added to Table 4.7-1

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.135	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		84. Sec 4.7.2.2, pg 4.7-8, line 6 - Last sentence indicates that the table identifies species “documented to occur within the ROI” but the table title indicates they are species “expected to occur.” Recommend that this difference be clarified or made consistent.	Clarified to state “Nonraptor avian species documented <u>expected</u> to occur within the ROI”
276.136	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		85. Sec 4.7.2.2, pgs 4.7-9; 4.7-14, 4.7-19, Table 4.7-2; Table 4.7-3; Table 4.7-5 - Many of the special status species analyzed for the project are not included in tables in Section 4.7.2. For example, the southwestern willow flycatcher, yellow-billed cuckoo, and mountain plover are missing from Table 4.7-2; the black-footed ferret from Table 4.7-3; the Mexican gray wolf from Section 4.7-5. Recommend a close cross-check between these tables and the species selected for analysis in Section 4.8 Special Status Species, as it seems that the species addressed in Section 4.8 should be a sub-set of what is presented in Section 4.7. If OSMRE prefers not to include the special status species in the tables in Section 4.7, then Section 4.7 should state that, “further discussion for special status species potentially occurring within the project is found in Section 4.8 Special Status Species.”	Missing species were added to Tables 4.7-2 (Baird’s sparrow, Mountain plover, southwestern willow flycatcher, and yellow-billed cuckoo) and 4.7-5 (black-footed ferret and Mexican gray wolf).
276.137	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		86. Sec 4.7.2.2, pg 4.7-17, line 4 - Remove reference to AECOM 2013f. The AECOM Habitat Model Report (AECOM 2013f) does not document the presence of hares and rabbits.	Reference Removed
276.138	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		87. Sec 4.7.2.2, pg 4.7-19, line 2 - AECOM also documented suitable habitat for Mexican gray wolf (AECOM 2013f).	Gray Wolf was added to Table 4.5-7
276.139	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		88. Sec 4.8.2.1, pgs 4.8-7, 4.8-15, 4.8-33, Table 4.8-1, Table 4.8-2, and 4.8-5 - Suitable California condor nesting habitat was modeled and field verified along the APS transmission lines (AECOM 2012f). Suitable Mexican spotted owl habitat was modeled within the deposition area around the FCPP and immediately adjacent to the APS transmission lines (i.e., within 0.5 miles of the t-lines) (AECOM 2012f). Northern Mexican garter snake, Canada lynx New Mexico population, and Yellow-billed cuckoo, are Proposed Threatened, no longer candidate. Update throughout. New Mexico jumping mouse, Three Forks Springsnail, and Fickeisen plains cactus are Endangered, no longer candidate or Proposed Endangered. Update throughout. Zuni bluehead sucker status is Proposed Endangered, no longer candidate. Update throughout. Navajo sedge, Zuni fleabane, Navajo bladderpod, Nokomis fritillary, Gooding’s onion, and Alcove bog orchard habitat were modeled and field verified during 2012 surveys of the APS transmission lines (AECOM 2012f).	Text Modified where appropriate for California condor. California condor carried forward for analysis in Section 4.8. Text Modified where appropriate for Mexican spotted owl. Mexican spotted owl carried forward for analysis in Section 4.8. Northern Mexican garter snake was listed Threatened 7/8/14 USFWS ( <a href="http://ecos.fws.gov/speciesProfile/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=C04Q">http://ecos.fws.gov/speciesProfile/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=C04Q</a> ). Tables and text have been updated to reflect the appropriate listing status of northern Mexican garter-snake in Section 4.8. Tables and text have been updated to reflect the appropriate listing status of Canada Lynx and yellow-billed cuckoo in Section 4.8. Tables and text have been updated to reflect the appropriate listing status of New Mexico jumping mouse, Three Forks spring snail, and Fickeisen plains cactus in Section 4.8. Tables and text have been updated to reflect the appropriate listing status of Zuni bluehead sucker in Section 4.8. Navajo bladderpod habitat was modeled but concluded as not present as a result of AECOM habitat analysis.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							Navajo sedge, Zuni fleabane, Nokomis fritillary, Goodings onion and Alcove bog orchid were all carried forward for analysis in the Draft EIS.
276.140	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		89. Sec 4.8.2.1, pg 4.8-6, Table 4.8-1 - Black footed ferret could be eliminated from further analysis because it has been extirpated in New Mexico since 1934.	Black-footed ferret has been noted as extirpated in New Mexico and discussion of impacts eliminated.
276.141	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		90. Sec 4.8.2.4, pg 4.8-7, 4.8-15, Table 4.8-1, 4.8-2 - The California condor was considered in the BA and the rationale for exclusion seems similar to other birds that are retained in these tables (e.g., yellow-billed cuckoo and southwestern willow flycatcher).	Discussion of potential impacts to California condor has been added to EIS.
276.142	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		91. Sec 4.8.2.1, pg 4.8-15, Table 4.8-2 - Potential habitat for the American dipper, Mexican spotted owl, Nokomis fritillary, and Gooding's onion were identified for the Deposition Area ERA; recommend not eliminating from further analysis, consistent with the BA and/or BE.	The potential presence of these species has been revisited and if determined to be potentially present, been discussed as appropriate in the EIS
276.143	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		92. Sec 4.8.2.1, pg 4.8-22, Table 4.8-3 - If table is specific to ROW, add that to the title and use that terminology (not "area" or "ROW area") in the Eliminated From Further Analysis column. Confirm that conclusion for black footed ferret should be different from Table 4.8-1.	Table is technically not specific to the PNM ROW. If other portions of the project extended onto such lands they would also be included in this table. In actuality the table becomes specific to the PNM ROW because that is the only portion of the project ROI that cross BLM, State, or private lands, as described in the text on Page 4.8-5. No change made to document.
276.144	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		93. Sec 4.8.2.3, pg 4.8-32, line 2 - Note that text indicates yellow-billed cuckoo is "known to occur within the deposition area" but the species is not listed in Table 4.7-2. Add to Table 4.7-2.	Discussion of potential impacts to yellow-billed cuckoo has been included in the EIS and added to the Table
276.145	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		94. Sec 4.8.2.3, pg 4.8-33, Table 4.8-5 - FCPP lease boundary area is within the pronghorn known range and contains suitable habitat. (AECOM 2012f).  Suitable wolf habitat was modeled and field verified along the APS transmission lines (AECOM 2012f).  Suitable Southwestern willow flycatcher habitat was modeled and field verified along the APS transmission lines west of US 491, along the Little Colorado River crossing, and east of US 491 south of Shiprock (AECOM 2012f).  Suitable northern leopard from habitat was field verified along the APS transmission lines at the Little Colorado River crossing (AECOM 2012f).	The Pronghorn has been carried forward for analysis in the EIS. Both text and tables now reflect this species potential occurrence within the lease area.  The wolf will continue to be excluded from consideration as the Mexican gray wolf and any limited potential habitat is too isolated to support this species within the ROI. The wolf could occur as a rare migrant through the ROI.  Southwestern willow flycatcher was carried forward for analysis in the Draft EIS. Both text and tables now reflect this species potential occurrence within the ROI.  Northern leopard frog was carried forward for analysis in the Final EIS. Both text and tables now reflect this species potential occurrence within the ROI.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.146	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		95. Sec 4.8.4, pg 4.8-69, line 9 - Same edits as in Section 4.6.4. Add footnote after “combustion of coal at the FCPP” - The scope of the ERAs is limited to evaluating the FCPP stack emissions because the proposed operations at the mine site would not emit the COPECs in sufficient magnitude to be considered in the ERA.	Clarification added
276.147	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		96. Sec 4.8.4, pg 4.8-69, line 9 -Same edits as in Section 4.6.4. Edit beginning of 3rd sentence “One ERA was conducted to evaluate ecological risks to both...”	Applicable changes were made to Section 4.6.4 of the Final EIS.
276.148	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		97. Sec 4.8.4, pg 4.8-69, line 9 - Same edits as in Section 4.6.4. Edit to be consistent with Section 4.1.4 description – “...within the area identified by air dispersion modeling as having a 1 percent future increase in soil metals concentrations above present-day concentrations per data provided by the USGS (AECOM 2013c).”	Apply as done for 4.6.4
276.149	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		98. Sec 4.8.4, pg 4.8-69, line 9 - Same edits as in Section 4.6.4. Provide a figure showing the boundary of the Deposition Area.	Applicable changes were made to Section 4.6.4 of the Final EIS. The Deposition Area has been added to figure 4.1-4.
276.150	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		99. Sec 4.8.4, pg 4.8-69, line 9 - Same edits as in Section 4.6.4. Edit sentence beginning with “The other ERA...” to “The second ERA was conducted to evaluate ecological risks associated with current conditions and future FCPP emissions as well as future regional and global emissions for...”	Applicable changes were made to Section 4.6.4 of the Final EIS.
276.151	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		100. Sec 4.8.4, pg 4.8-69, line 10 - Edit text to indicate COPECs were based on studies that considered “associated human health and ecological risks”	Clarification made
276.152	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		101. Sec 4.8.4, pg 4.8-69, line 10 - Define HQ as a hazard quotient if this is the first use of the term and add a footnote indicating “An HQ is calculated as an exposure point concentration (or dose) divided by the appropriate ecological screening value.”  Ecological risk is discussed in earlier sections. Could introduce HQs and overview of ERA approach in Section 4.6.4 Vegetation,4.7.4 Wildlife and Habitats, or Section 4.1.4 Air Quality	Clarification made
276.153	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		102. Sec 4.8.4, pg 4.8-70, line 1 - Edit text to clarify FCPP contributions “While the ERAs identified a number of COPECs with elevated HQs related to Current Conditions, future FCPP emissions associated with the Proposed Action did not contribute significantly to this risk.”	Clarification made
276.154	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		103. Sec 4.9.2.1, pg 4.9-8, line 8 - The transmission line does not end at Moenkopi Substation, but continues another 14 miles before exiting the Navajo Nation.	Clarified

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.155	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		104. Sec 4.10.4.1, pg 4.10-29, line 1 - APS has selected urea to provide ammonia for SCR operation. Urea creates minimal risk during transportation. Therefore this discussion of the impacts of accidental release should be removed.	The entire document has been reviewed to indicate that APS has selected the urea option.
276.156	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		105. Sec 4.11.3.1, pg 4.11-18, line 1 - Replace first paragraph with: "The potential to contaminate local groundwater will be minimized by installing composite liners for all future DFADAs. The operation of existing trenches will reduce the likelihood of existing groundwater entering Chaco Wash (see Section 4.5, Water Resources/Hydrology). Operations regarding uptake and discharge of water for Morgan Lake would not adversely affect surface water quality of water bodies in the plant's vicinity."	Referenced discussion does not require this change.
276.157	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		106. Sec 4.11.3.1, pg 4.11-22, line 7 - APS has selected urea to supply ammonia to the SCR. The first 7 lines of this paragraph no longer apply.	Change made
276.158	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		107. Sec 4.11.3.1, pg 4.11-23, line 2 - eplace "APS is currently in the process of installing..." with "APS has installed."	Change made
276.159	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		108. Sec 4.11.3.5, pg. 4.11-36, line 2 - Replace OSMRE with OSMRE/BIA.	Change made
276.160	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		109. Sec 4.11.3.5, pg 4.11-36, line 3 - Replace OSMRE with OSMRE/BIA.	Change made
276.161	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		110. Sec 4.12.4.1, pg 4.12-8 - The purpose of the berms described in this section is for storm water management, not to contain ash.	As stated in the paragraph "berms would be constructed around the areas to restrict any soils containing CCR that could impact surrounding soils" Text changed to: The new DFADA cells would be lined with synthetic liners to minimize infiltration. The cells would be surrounded by a berm whose size is designed to capture a 100 year, 24 hour storm event without runoff. The stormwater that lands on the DFADA flows to an adjacent lined depression (stormwater pond), which is used for dust control or pumped to the Lined Decant Water Pond. In this way, stormwater that falls on the DFADA cells, and associated runoff, is retained. Stormwater that falls on surrounding areas, outside the DFADA cells, would be channeled around the cells to the Chaco Wash by a system of berms so that the unaffected runoff does not comingle with the DFADA area.
276.162	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		111. Sec 4.12.4.1, pg 4.12-10 - Change to read: "Such required environmental protection measures are expected to limit any adverse effects to surface water ITAs to minor impacts. No additional mitigation measures would be required."	Change made

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.163	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>112. Sec 4.15 - See APS Narrative Comment Letter at 21 and Attachment C for recommended revisions:</p> <p>As described in Section 4.15 in the DEIS, EPA has proposed two regulatory options to govern the disposal of CCR—to regulate CCR under Subtitle C or under Subtitle D of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. OSMRE correctly concluded that EPA would enforce Subtitle C CCR regulations at the FCPP if EPA selects this approach. However, OSMRE has incorrectly assumed that there would be a regulatory gap if EPA decides to finalize Subtitle D. As described in the regulatory explanation provided in Attachment C to these comments, there would be no regulatory gap even if EPA finalizes Subtitle D regulations. EPA has made clear that Subtitle D regulations would be self-implementing—owners and operators of CCR landfills and surface impoundments would be required to comply with the rules without interaction with the regulatory agency. APS requests that the final EIS reflect that there would be no regulatory gap, for the reasons described in Attachment C.</p>	See response to comment 276.003
276.164	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>113. Sec 4.15.1.2, pg 4.15-3, line 7 - The statement that air quality controls such as FGD and SCR concentrate metals and contaminants in the CCR is incorrect. While there may be traces of ammonia in the ash from the fabric filter and the FGD water due to the use of this reagent in the SCR system, there is no reason to believe that the SCR would concentrate the metals in the ash. The SCR and FGD are not expected to have any major effect on the ash or the FGD sludge.</p>	Thank you for your comment. The text has been revised to indicate that decreases in metal emissions are completely attributable to the shut-down of Units 1, 2, and 3 and not related to the FGD or SCR system. The following sentence has been removed from the section: Air quality controls such as FGD and SCR are designed to reduce the volume of these compounds emitted into air, which then concentrates them in the CCR.
276.165	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>114. Sec 4.15.2.2, pg 4.15-10, Table 4.15-3 - APS no longer burns used oil on-site.</p>	Table has been revised to indicate revised disposal method and location.
276.166	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>115. Sec 4.15.2.2, pg 4.15-11, line 3 - Edit as follows: “As of October 2011, the evaporation ponds are no longer in use, and have been reclaimed.”</p>	Change made
276.167	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>116. Sec 4.15.2.2, pg 4.15-18, line 5 - Revise the statement that “no demolition or disposal activities are anticipated until the end of life of the facility.” Portions of unused structures like Units 1 – 3 could potentially be demolished or disposed before completion of the project.</p>	Revised
276.168	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>117. Sec 4.15.2.2, pg 4.15-27, line 2 - The total area of the DFADAs under the Proposed Action is 385 acres, not 350 acres as stated here.</p>	Corrected
276.169	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>118. Sec 4.15.4.1, pg 4.15-18, line 5 - Units 1-2-3 will be demolished as described in Sec. 2.4.2.2, heading titled “Shutdown of Units 1-3. Carry through all alternatives.</p>	Revised

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.170	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		119. Sec 4.15.4.1, pg 4.15-20, Table 4.15-8 - The use of urea will result in the manufacture of ammonia, which will require reporting under TSCA and TRI.	Modified as suggested
276.171	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		120. Sec 4.15.4.1, pg 4.15-27, line 2 - Replace the beginning of the first paragraph under the heading CCR Management with: “FGD waste generated from Units 4 and 5 would continue to be placed in the lined ash impoundment until it is full or closed. Ash and bottom ash would continue to be placed in DFADA Sites 1 and 2 until these sites reach capacity...”	Changes made
276.172	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		121. Sec 4.15.4.5, pg 4.15-30, line 5 - EPA’s BART rule went into effect at the beginning of 2014, not in 2016 when the lease expires.  All 3 switchyards probably would not be decommissioned and demolished under No Action alternative because they are used to transmit power from other sources.  Any decisions regarding the future uses of the FCPP must be with the concurrence of the Navajo Nation, not the other power owners.  OSMRE does not have the authority to approve the closure plan for the FCPP.	Text has been revised accordingly.
276.173	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		122. Sec 4.15.4.5, pg 4.15-31, line 1 - The transmission lines would not be removed because they wheel power for other sources besides the FCPP. They would likely not be decommissioned and dismantled, but decommissioning and dismantling would have to involve the Navajo Nation, Hopi Tribe, the BLM, and private landowners and Zia Pueblo in the case of the PNM West Mesa line.	No change made
276.174	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		123. Sec 4.16.4.1, pg 4.16-11 - There will be no new ash pond, only new DFADAs and a lined surge pond. Please delete all references to future ash ponds.	Clarified globally
276.175	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		124. Sec 4.17.4.1, pg 4.17-24 - The third paragraph states that the HHRA indicates that operation of FCPP for 25 years “would not have a major impact on health” but then at the end of the paragraph, states that the effects are “minor”. Please consider a revision of the third sentence in the third paragraph on this page to read: “Therefore, the HHRA demonstrates that operation of FCPP units 4 and 5 with SCR (and with units 1, 2 and 3 shut down) over the next 25 years would not have an appreciable adverse impact on human health.”	No change made. This is a general discussion on regulatory compliance.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.176	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		125. Sec 4.17.4.5, pg 4.17-26, line 7 - Coordination with BLM would not be required.	Changed sentence as follows: As with the FCPP, decommissioning and dismantling activities would need to be coordinated with the Navajo Nation and/or the BLM (depending on the land crossed by each subject line, e.g. the FCPP to Cholla line only crosses Navajo Nation jurisdiction and would not require coordination with BLM), such that the area meets the specific needs of the planned reuse.
276.177	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		126. Sec 4.18.3.1, pg 4.18.38-39 - Please clarify whether projected future emissions reduction requirements for other power plants are taken into account in tables 14.8-2 and 14.8-3.	The Draft EIS did not include San Juan Generating Station projected changes; however, the Final EIS contains the information about San Juan Generating Station and other regional changes (see Comment 298.006).
276.178	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		127. Sec 4.18.3.5, pg 4.18-43, line 2 - Per Figure 4.18-1, not all of the power plants referenced in this paragraph are within the San Juan River Basin, which is defined as the study area, and not all of them are coal-fired power plants. Per the EPRI report (cited as EPRI 2013 in DEIS), there are 3 coal-fired power plants in the San Juan River Basin (see Figure 2-1). The San Juan River ERA demonstrates that it is overly conservative to state, as the DEIS does, that there would be “potentially major, long-term cumulative impacts” to surface water from these sources.	Comment noted.
276.179	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		128. Sec 4.18.3.8, pg 4.18-44, line 5 - Replace reference to EPRI 2013 with AECOM 2013c in the 2nd sentence  Add reference to AECOM 2013h at the end of the 4th sentence  Clarify what “These contaminants” refers to – Suggested edit - “Emissions related contaminants associated with the Proposed Action and local and regional sources have the potential...”	Changes made
276.180	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		129. Sec 4.18.3.8, pg 4.18-45, line 1 - The cumulative effect study area includes more than just the Deposition Area. Replace 1st full sentence with: “Therefore, the cumulative effects study area for threatened and endangered wildlife species includes the Deposition Area, as well as the San Juan River from the eastern boundary of the Deposition Area downstream into the San Juan arm of Lake Powell.”	Change made
276.181	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		130. Sec 4.18.3.8, pg 4.18-45, line 2 - Edit to be consistent with Section 4.1.4 description – “...within the area identified by air dispersion modeling as having a 1 percent future increase in soil metals concentrations above present-day concentrations per data provided by the USGS (AECOM 2013c).”	Reviewed for consistency
276.182	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		131. Sec 4.18.3.8, pg 4.18-45, line 4 - Rephrase 1st sentence. Section 4.8 considers special status species. Refer to Section 4.6 and 4.7 for the evaluation of representative plants and wildlife, respectively.	Change made

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.183	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		132. Sec 4.18.3.8, pg 4.18-45, line 4 - Include the "Total HQ" footnote in the sentence referring to the "Current Conditions + FCPP Contributions" scenario.	The Draft EIS is correct. No change made
276.184	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>133. Sec 4.18.3.8, pg 4.18-45 to 4.18-46, multiple lines - In the summary of HQs it is unclear whether the HQs are based on screening level or refined evaluations. Introductory text is recommended to clarify which is appropriate for this section. It is recognized that screening level HQs may be relevant to some immobile listed species, but the refined HQs are expected to be relevant to most non-listed or mobile species.</p> <p>It is recommended that the fish tissue HQ discussions also consider the alternate fish toxicity values (0.2 mg/kg for Hg and 1 mg/kg for Se) discussed in the ERA. The Current Conditions dataset did not target early life stage fish and the estimates of fish tissue from the FCPP used uptake factors for generic fish. Comparing the Current Conditions and FCPP datasets against toxicity values based on early life stage fish will over-estimate risks to juvenile and adult fish. The alternate fish toxicity values are more appropriate for these comparisons.</p>	Section 4.18.3 has been reviewed and revised as appropriate with regard to these comments and revised as appropriate and consistent with the discussion of this issue in the BA.
276.185	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>134. Sec 4.18.3.8, pg. 4.18-45, lines 4 and 5 - It appears these HQs are the result of the screening level ERA conducted with the maximum detected and predicted concentrations. If this is intentional, this should be made clear in the text. This assumption is likely to over-estimate actual risks. It is suggested that the refined HQ results are more applicable to most receptors. See below for suggested edits to paragraph 4 and beginning of paragraph 5 (assuming the screening level HQs are retained):</p> <p>"In total, for the "Current Conditions + FCPP Contributions" scenario, the two ERAs reported 67 instances in which the screening level total HQs1 based on maximum concentrations exceeded a value of 1 indicating a potential risk to ecological receptors. For terrestrial receptors within the Deposition Area, screening level total HQs greater than 1 ranged from 1.5 to 37 with boron, chromium, and vanadium presenting the highest total HQs, most frequently for terrestrial plants. These elevated screening level total HQs were observed for representative terrestrial invertebrates, plants, birds, and wildlife as well as the federally listed Mancos milk-vetch and Mesa Verde cactus (AECOM 2013c). It is unlikely that ecological receptors would be continually exposed to maximum concentrations, so risks are expected to be over-estimated.</p> <p>Within the Deposition Area aquatic and riparian habitats of Morgan Lake, screening level total HQs greater than 1 based on maximum concentrations ranged from 2.3 to 190, largely due to potential barium, lead, nickel, and selenium exposures to generic aquatic receptors and fish. The highest total HQ of 190 was due to maximum selenium exposure to generic adult life stage Morgan Lake fish."</p>	Section 4.18.3 has been reviewed and revised as appropriate with regard to these comments and revised as appropriate and consistent with the discussion of this issue in the BA.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.186	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>135. Sec 4.18.3.8, pg 4.18-45, line 1 - Willow flycatcher is also the surrogate for the federal candidate species yellow-billed cuckoo. Add the cuckoo to this sentence. It is noted that these HQs are from the refined Morgan Lake evaluation, as is appropriate for these mobile receptors. Suggest indicating that these are “total HQs from the refined evaluation” and adding a footnote that states:</p> <p>“For the assessment of mobile species (e.g., birds, mammals, adult fish), refined HQs based on 95% upper confidence limit [UCL] media concentrations (an estimate of the average concentration with 95 percent confidence that the true mean concentration is less than this value), rather than maximum concentrations are applicable because exposure for mobile species is largely related to foraging behavior. The use of maximum media concentrations for mobile species would be unrealistic and would likely overestimate HQs.”</p>	Section 4.18.3 has been reviewed and revised as appropriate with regard to these comments and revised as appropriate and consistent with the discussion of this issue in the BA.
276.187	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>136. Sec 4.18.3.8, pg 4.18-46, line 2 - It appears that these HQs represent screening level HQs from the San Juan River evaluation in the Deposition Area ERA. Suggest revising as follows:</p> <p>“The aquatic and riparian habitat of the San Juan River within the Deposition Area exhibited screening level total HQs greater than 1 ranging from 1.5 to 220 based on maximum concentrations largely due to potential aluminum, barium, copper, lead, methylmercury, nickel, selenium, vanadium, and zinc exposures to generic aquatic receptors and fish. The highest screening level total HQs of 180 and 220 were due to maximum nickel and selenium exposures to generic San Juan River fish. As stated previously, it is unlikely that ecological receptors would be continually exposed to maximum concentrations, so risks are expected to be over-estimated. Because the available fish tissue data set from within the San Juan River and the estimated fish tissue associated with the Proposed Action did not include early life stage fish, the HQs based on early life stage toxicity values are likely to over-estimate risks to juvenile and adult fish.</p> <p>Similar to Morgan Lake, the willow flycatcher, which represents the federally listed southwestern willow flycatcher and candidate yellow-billed cuckoo exhibited elevated total HQs under the refined evaluation ranging from 1.1 to 6.6 with the highest total HQs of 2.4 and 6.6 due to selenium and methylmercury, respectively (AECOM 2013c).”</p>	Section 4.18.3 has been reviewed and revised as appropriate with regard to these comments and revised as appropriate and consistent with the discussion of this issue in the BA.
276.188	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>137. Sec 4.18.3.8, pg 4.18-46, line 3 - These HQs appear to be from the “Current Conditions + FCPP-only Contributions” refined evaluation, as is appropriate for these mobile fish. Suggest clarifying the text to refer to “refined total HQs” within this pa</p>	Section 4.18.3 has been reviewed and revised as appropriate with regard to these comments and revised as appropriate and consistent with the discussion of this issue in the BA.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.189	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		138. Sec 4.18.3.8, pg 4.18-46, line 3 - Suggested edit to clarify fish HQs because early life stage fish were not specifically modeled and were not targeted in the sampling on which Current Conditions were based:  “Specifically, elevated refined total HQs related to mercury exposure ranged from 3.0 to 3.8 for forage fish and the federally listed razorback sucker and from 1.8 to 12 for the federally listed Colorado pikeminnow. Elevated refined total HQs related to selenium exposure ranged from 1.5 to 71 for generic fish (AECOM 2013h). Because the available fish tissue data set from within the San Juan River and the estimated fish tissue associated with the Proposed Action did not include early life stage fish, the HQs based on early life stage toxicity values are likely to over-estimate risks to juvenile and adult fish.”	Section 4.18.3 has been reviewed and revised as appropriate with regard to these comments and revised as appropriate and consistent with the discussion of this issue in the BA.
276.190	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		139. Sec 4.18.3.8, pg 4.18-46, line 6 - Edit last sentence of paragraph to indicate: “This suggests that sensitive plants and invertebrates could be at risk of adverse effects in areas of higher naturally occurring barium concentrations or that some species may be tolerant of higher barium levels than the species used to derive the Eco-SSLs.”	Section 4.18.3 has been reviewed and revised as appropriate with regard to these comments and revised as appropriate and consistent with the discussion of this issue in the BA.
276.191	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		140. Sec 4.18.3, pg 4.18-48, line 1 - Because this is the first mention of Scenario 8, suggest adding a footnote:  “Scenario 8 represents the highest emissions-related contributions to the watershed modeled in the San Juan River ERA and assumes a high increase in mercury emissions from China (AECOM 2013h).”	The discussion of ecological risk was revised throughout the document to address this and other comments and to be made consistent with the discussion of this issue in the BA.
276.192	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		141. Sec 4.18.3, pg 4.18-45, Table 4.18-7 - Suggest adding a footnote indicating that:  “Because the available fish tissue data set from within the San Juan River and the estimated fish tissue associated with the Proposed Action and Scenario 8 did not include early life stage fish, these HQs which are based on early life stage toxicity values, are likely to over-estimate risks to juvenile and adult fish.”  It is recommended that the fish tissue HQ discussions also consider the alternate fish toxicity values (0.2 mg/kg for Hg and 1 mg/kg for Se) discussed in the ERA.	Section 4.18.3 has been reviewed and revised as appropriate with regard to these comments and revised as appropriate and consistent with the discussion of this issue in the BA.
276.193	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		142. Sec 4.18.3, pg 4.18-48, Last paragraph - Suggest editing first sentence to state: “metals concentrations under Current Conditions alone may pose a potential risk to some sensitive ecological receptors within the Deposition Area as well as in the San Juan River downstream of the Deposition Area.”	Change made

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.194	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>143. Sec 4.18.3, pg 4.18-49, line 1 - Recommend deleting the HQs listed in the 1st full sentence [the HQ of 190 is for Morgan Lake, the HQ of 12 is based on adult pikeminnow compared to an early life stage toxicity value, the HQ of 71 is based on adult fish].</p> <p>HQs based on maximum concentrations or based on highly conservative comparisons (e.g., juvenile/adult tissues compared to early lifestage toxicity values) will over-estimate risks and should not be used to identify population level risks. Suggested edit:</p> <p>“Even at the lower range of HQs that assume status quo Current Conditions in combination with future FCPP emissions, elevated HQs indicate the potential for adverse effects to some individual receptors.”</p>	Section 4.18.3 has been reviewed and revised as appropriate with regard to these comments and revised as appropriate and consistent with the discussion of this issue in the BA.
276.195	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>144. Sec 4.18.3, pg 4.18-49, line 2 - The suggestion of “major” impacts from the 1st sentence overstates impacts. Without more site-specific data (e.g., species specific toxicity studies), it is impossible to quantify or estimate a magnitude of potential impacts as major.</p>	Section 4.18.3 has been reviewed and revised as appropriate with regard to these comments and revised as appropriate and consistent with the discussion of this issue in the BA.
276.196	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>145. Sec 4.18.3, pg 4.18-49, line 2 - Based on the results discussed within this section and in the ERAs, which indicate that the FCPP contributes very little to overall risks, it seems an overstatement of impacts to conclude that the contribution to cumulative impacts to threatened and endangered species is moderate. The ERAs indicate that risks to these species are essentially unchanged by the FCPP contributions. A conclusion that the FCPP’s future contributions to cumulative impacts are “negligible” would be more appropriate.</p>	Section 4.18.3 has been reviewed and revised as appropriate with regard to these comments and revised as appropriate and consistent with the discussion of this issue in the BA.
276.197	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>146. Sec 5.1.1.2, pg 5-2, line 8 - BLM does not have regulatory approval for the portion of the FCPP to Cholla transmission lines that are part of the Proposed Action.</p>	Removed FCPP to Cholla transmission line from this sentence.
276.198	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>147. Sec 5.1.4.1, pg 5-6 - A jurisdictional wetlands and waters of the U.S. investigation was prepared for APS and is cited in the DEIS as AECOM 2012b. The findings from this report are referenced in Section 4.5.2.2 beginning on page 4.5-33. Please add a cross reference to this information and a description of the consultation on page 5-6.</p>	Cross-reference added.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
276.199	Ms.	Stacey	VanBellehgem	APS (Arizona Public Service Company)		<p>148. Sec 5.1.4.1, pg 5-6 - Remove sentence: "In this case, the certification would be issued by the NNEPA Water Quality Program verifying that the Navajo Nation Surface Water Quality Standards will be met when the discharge occurs." See APS Narrative Comment Letter at 9-10.</p> <p>APS requests that OSMRE remove the following statement from Section 5.1.4.1 (Water Resources): "Any activity requiring a Federal permit, license, or approval that results in a discharged [sic] into a water of the U.S. must receive Clean Water Act Section 401 Certification. In this case, the certification would be issued by the NNEPA Water Quality Program verifying that the Navajo Nation Surface Water Quality Standards will be met when the discharge occurs." (emphasis added.) In EPA's Decision Document for the Approval of the Navajo Nation Application for Treatment in the Same Manner as a State for Sections 303(c) and 401 of the Clean Water Act dated January 20, 2006, EPA explains that in its application for treatment as a state, the Navajo Nation expressly excluded Morgan Lake from the scope of the application. As a result, EPA concluded that the application "effectively does not include land the Tribe leases for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Generating Station," including Morgan Lake. Moreover, Section 17 of the lease between the Navajo Nation and FCPP participants prohibits the applicability of Navajo Nation Surface Water Quality Standards to FCPP. Accordingly, the italicized language above should not be included in the final EIS</p>	See Master Response #11, Covenant 17
277.001	Mr.	Bruce	Voiles		06/26/14	My support is due to the reduction of pollutants as a result on the shutting down of Units 1,2 and 3, plus installation of pollution control upgrades on Units 4 and 5.	Thank you for your comment. For clarification, the Federal Implementation Plan for the FCPP is a separate action conducted by the EPA and is considered as a baseline condition in the EIS. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.
278.001	Mr.	Clifton	Horace		06/26/14	Please please please consider the huge unemployment we have on the reservation and how important these jobs are to us.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
279.001	Mr.	William	Kelly	NTEC		NTEC believes, however, that while OSM’s analysis complies fully with NEPA, OSM appears to have underestimated the harm to the Navajo Nation if the no action alternative were selected, in part because economic data and studies available to OSM, principally the 2013 Arizona State University (“ASU”) study, may not fully address the multiplier effect of the loss of \$40 million annually to the Navajo Nation that would otherwise pay for governmental services and government jobs. Moreover, profits to NTEC are the only practical means for the Navajo Nation and its wholly owned enterprise to pay for the transition to a new energy economy relying on clean energy alternatives, including emerging clean coal technologies. The Final EIS could more fully discuss that without approval of the Project, NTEC’s tremendous promise to the Navajo Nation and the region will be lost.	The economic impacts provided in the Draft EIS are based on a study developed by Arizona State University. This study used San Juan County and the State of New Mexico as the two primary study areas; therefore, there are no specific calculations or data to discuss specific multiplier effects to the Navajo Nation under the No Action alternative. Rather, these effects are assumed to be captured in both the study areas provided in the Draft EIS.
279.002	Mr.	William	Kelly	NTEC		Additionally, and although OSM correctly recognizes the federal trust responsibility and federal Indian policies promoting tribal self-determination, see, e.g., DEIS at 1-9, the Final EIS could further <b>clarify that the principal environmental justice community of concern for the Project is the Navajo Nation, which has a government-to-government relationship with OSM and the other federal cooperating agencies.</b> That OSM extensively reached out to local Navajo communities, through the scoping process and for comments on the DEIS, including in the Navajo language, is laudable, and was very important as part of the public outreach required by NEP A. Nonetheless, of particular import in the context of environmental, social and economic justice for the Navajo Nation is <b>that the Nation’s democratically elected leaders-the Navajo Nation Council and President-have repeatedly, with supermajority votes in the Council, and on behalf of the whole Navajo people, supported this Project moving forward. That unflinching support from the leaders of the Navajo Nation for the Project, which is almost wholly located on the Navajo Nation’s tribal trust lands, cannot be emphasized enough and could be further expounded on in the Final EIS. The Navajo Nation’s vast coal resources are reserved to the Navajo Nation under the Treaty of 1868 and the various Executive Orders and Acts that established the Navajo Reservation (The Navajo Mine and the FCPP leases are principally located in the 1880 Executive Order Reservation, an area of the Navajo Reservation which has been implicitly ratified by Congress. See, e.g., United States v. Midwest Oil Company, 236 U.S. 459, 469-473 (1915); Arizona v. California, 373 U.S. 546, 598 (1963), overruled on other grounds by California v. United States, 438 U.S. 645 (1978)); see also 25 U.S.C. § 398d (changes to Executive Order reservations require Act of Congress) and are its principal tribal trust assets. The Navajo Nation has a fundamental treaty right to develop these resources for its own economic prosperity and energy security, and it has chosen to do so by creating NTEC and supporting the Project.</b>	Thank you for your comment. Section 5 of the Draft EIS contains lengthy discussion on the outreach, coordination, and consultation that OSMRE has performed in preparing the Draft EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
279.003	Mr.	William	Kelly	NTEC	06/26/14	<p>The Navajo Nation’s opportunity to purchase the Mine arose in large part because of a rulemaking by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) for Best Available Retrofit Technology (“BART”) under the Clean Air Act that caused APS to close three of the five Units at FCPP resulting in a decrease of the annual average coal bum at FCPP from approximately 8 or 9 million tons to roughly 6 million tons of coal under the current coal supply agreement (with the attendant reduction in air emissions and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions) (FOOT NOTE: Arizona Public Service Company (“APS”) owned 100% of Units 1, 2, and 3 of FCPP, which it shut down at the end of 2013 as a result of the BART ruling. APS also recently purchased Southern California Edison’s share of Units 4 and 5, giving it a 63% share in the remaining operations. The other owners of FCPP are Public Service Company of New Mexico (“PNM”) with 13%, Salt River Project with 10%, and Tucson Electric Power and El Paso Electric each with 7%. DEIS at 1-2. Units 4 and 5 will be brought into compliance with the BART ruling by retrofitting selective catalytic reduction technology, which will further significantly reduce air and GHG emissions from the historic baseline. See, e.g., DEIS at 2-38). This decreased volume made the mining operation unattractive to BHP Billiton for the continued investment in and operation of the Navajo Mine. <b>The Navajo Nation was thus offered a singular opportunity to purchase the Navajo Mine, and, for the first time to not merely lease its coal resources to others, but to control and develop them by and on its own behalf, thus having the ability to steward the human and natural environments within the Navajo Nation’s territorial jurisdiction in accordance with Navajo Fundamental Law, including the doctrine of k’e (The Navajo people believe that the natural world is an intricately connected and interdependent web of relationships, a great kinship which includes the earth, the sky, the plants and animals, and human beings, human culture, and ceremony. The continued use of the hooghan at the Navajo Mine for traditional Navajo ceremonies by the employees and their families, see DEIS at 4.11-17, including those ceremonies for the purpose of healing such relationships under k’e, is critical to mitigating adverse impacts to the natural world from resource extraction, and is an important component of NTEC’s policy to incorporate Navajo values and culture into NTEC’s business model)</b></p>	have added discussion on the natural law section into the EIS in Section 1.4.26
279.004	Mr.	William	Kelly	NTEC		<p>In the DEIS, the only Navajo governmental services that OSM fully analyzes are education and public safety. See DEIS at 4.10-19. These are certainly critical services, especially given the limited number of public safety personnel, the 27,000 square miles of Navajo lands that have to be patrolled, and the extremely rural pattern of living on the Navajo Nation (the Navajo people generally do not live in traditional western style communities). In addition to education and public safety, <b>OSM should also consider that these dollars directly benefit chapters and tribal members at the local level, including providing for bathroom and kitchen additions, inigation projects, weatherization programs, etc.</b></p>	As stated, the Draft EIS characterizes the housing environment on the Navajo Nation tribal trust lands, but it is beyond the purview of the NEPA process to analyze how the Tribe allocates revenues from FCPP and Navajo Mine operations. The Draft EIS identifies the range of benefits (i.e. revenues, tax payments) the Tribe realizes from project operations and notes that these benefits represent approximately 1/3 of the administrative tribal budget. The Draft EIS states that the loss of this amount of operating administrative tribal budget would be major.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						In its analysis, OSM determined that, in terms of housing in the Region of Influence (“ROI”) of the Project, the Navajo Nation was the most crowded, had the fewest rooms per capita, the fewest bedrooms, the highest percentage lacking complete plumbing facilities, the highest number without telephone service, and, along with the Hopi Tribe, the highest percentage of housing lacking complete kitchen facilities. DEIS at 4.10- 18. Indeed, as OSM recognizes, a shocking 38% of households on the Navajo Nation are below the poverty level. See DEIS, Table 4.10-15. Thus, 19,000 households or approximately 66,000 Navajo tribal members, living on the Reservation, are living in poverty. The funding from FCPP and the Navajo Mine has real-world impacts on poverty at the local level on the Navajo Nation.	
279.005	Mr.	William	Kelly	NTEC		OSM should also recognize in its analysis that royalties and taxes from FCPP and the Navajo Mine also directly benefit veterans’ programs, provide senior services, and build veterans centers, senior centers and other community centers, which generally also include community internet access and public computers. Local internet access is crucial if the Navajo Nation is ever to bridge the “digital divide,” and overcome the social and economic inequality resulting from a lack of access to information and technology that other Americans take for granted in the 21st century. Other educational and cultural benefits from coal royalties and taxes include providing government funding for preservation of Navajo language and culture through Navajo immersion programs in elementary schools, the recent dubbing of Star Wars into the Navajo language, Navajo fairs across the Navajo Nation, and funding provided to Dine College and its programs for recording and preserving Navajo language, ceremonies and creation stories.	Please see the response to comment 279.004.
279.006	Mr.	William	Kelly	NTEC		In its socioeconomic analysis, OSM states that it is analyzing “direct effects,” “indirect effects,” and “induced effects.” DEIS at 4.10-8. Although OSM analyzes local and regional multiplier effects for these three categories in San Juan County and the State of New Mexico, see DEIS Tables 4.10-22 through 4.10-25, OSM could also consider additional economic multiplier effects on the Navajo Nation. OSM could reasonably extrapolate the ripple effects on the Navajo Nation of the \$40 million going to the Navajo Nation each year, as well as multipliers from the jobs at the Navajo Mine and the FCPP. Moreover, because of Navajo cultural obligations to extended family, each worker at the Navajo Mine and FCPP, earning some of the highest wages on the Navajo Nation, partly or fully supports as many as 18 other family members, all of whom contribute to and participate in the Navajo economy. OSM could also reasonably observe that the Navajo taxes that are collected from vendors that provide goods and services to the Navajo Mine and the FCPP also positively impact the Navajo economy and provide for government services. This additional discussion would help underscore the draft analyses, and further support the selection of the preferred alternative (or Alternative D) and the rejection of the no action alternative.	Please see response to comment 279.001. Further, the Draft EIS recognizes the benefits project operations (i.e. employment) create for the Navajo Nation, including its members employed at either the Navajo Mine or FCPP. Please see Draft EIS Section 4.10.3.2 and 4.10.4 for additional information on how the project affects the Navajo Nation and its membership employed by FCPP or Navajo Mine.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
279.007	Mr.	William	Kelly	NTEC		<p>The unemployment statistic cited in the DEIS by OSM, that based on the most recent census data the Navajo Nation only has a 15.6% unemployment rate, see DEIS at 4.10-14, ought to be considered in the context of actual employment opportunity on the Navajo Nation, and in that context is likely underestimated by OSM. As OSM recognizes, the Navajo Nation’s own Division of Economic Development places the unemployment rate at 51%. !d. Based on the other statistical data OSM provides and relies on in its analysis, the unemployment rate given by the Nation’s own economic agency is likely more accurate (OSM acknowledges this unemployment rate in the DEIS at 4.10-31 (placing it at 51%). For example, OSM observes that only 7.1% of Navajo tribal members living on the Reservation have Bachelor’s or advanced degrees, DEIS, Table 4.10-14, and the percentage of Navajo tribal members living below the poverty level is 38%, DEIS, Table 4.10-15. OSM places 57% of the Reservation population between 18 and 64 years of age, or approximately 99,000 tribal members who are therefore of working age, DEIS, Table 4.10-4, yet OSM only identifies approximately half of these as in the civilian labor force (53,056), DEIS, Table 4.10-6. 44,757 of those are actually employed, DEIS, Table 4.10-5, yielding the 15.6% unemployment figure cited by OSM (53,056- 44,757/53,056 = 15.6%). However, why only 1 of every 2 tribal members of employment age is counted in the “workforce” could be further elucidated by OSM, where it is likely that tribal members were not counted as being in the workforce if they were not actively seeking employment at the time of the census. Unfortunately, tribal members cannot be actively seeking jobs where there simply are no jobs available, as is the case for most of the Reservation. Additionally, although there may be a so-called “informal economy” on the Navajo Nation, it does not substitute for real jobs with benefits. Compare DEIS at 4.10-14. The supposition that there are full-blown “industries” on the Reservation in tourism, arts and crafts, and domestic services does not appear to be accurate, and the true extent of any such economic activities should be clarified. Compare id. Moreover, OSM may wish to clarify that if the preferred alternative is not selected, income level and social support programs on the Reservation will be reduced (not merely “may,” see DEIS at 4.10-14). There will be less educational attainment, more crime and recidivism, less healthcare access, and more inadequate housing. See DEIS at 4.10-14.</p>	<p>Section 4.10.2.3 does include in the 51 percent unemployment figure provided by the Tribe. However, to provide “apples-to-apples” comparisons, the same data sets should be used to describe effects/conditions across varying geographical areas (i.e. comparing Navajo Nation tribal trust lands to the State of New Mexico). The Draft EIS also concludes that the selection of the No Action alternative would result in a “major” effect to the Navajo Nation (see response to comment 279.006 and Section 4.10.4.5).</p>
279.008	Mr.	William	Kelly	NTEC		<p>As OSM acknowledges, NTEC is mandated by the Navajo Nation Council to invest part of its profits in transitioning the Navajo Nation’s energy economy and portfolio to clean coal technologies and alternative energies, including wind and solar, see, e.g., DEIS at 4.10-27, 4.11- 20. <b>However, the beneficial impacts of NTEC’s investments of its projected profits could be described further in support of OSM’s analysis.</b> OSM notes that under the no action alternative, all activity at FCPP would cease, but leaves open the possibility that “other economic activities, such as production of renewable energy, [may] develop to replace the employment and income opportunities at the FCPP and the</p>	<p>As referenced, the Draft EIS contains discussion on the objectives of NTEC’s mission in creating renewable and/or alternative energy generation (see Section 4.10.3.2). OSMRE cannot speculate on the potential effects of this project on future business decisions that would be made by NTEC. The impacts of lost profits are therefore outside the scope of this analysis. However, potential loss of revenues to the Navajo Nation is discussed in Section 4.10.4.5.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						Navajo Mine. . .” DEIS at 4.10-30. That is precisely what NTEC’s mission-to be funded by the profits from the proposed Project-is going forward, as noted earlier in these comments. What is important to understand, and what outside environmental interest groups fail to confront, is that such a transition has to be funded, and will likely cost in the tens if not hundreds of millions of dollars to research, develop and implement. NTEC is the only practical means by which the Navajo Nation can transition from an economy based on traditional fossil fuel extraction and power production to one based on cleaner energy resources and technologies, using the profits of NTEC.	
279.009	Mr.	William	Kelly	NTEC		However, if the Project goes through, and NTEC is able to begin making profits from the Navajo Mine, its mission and mandate is to make the transition to new energy sources and technologies a reality. Working with federal, state and Navajo Nation partners, NTEC plans to develop a world class energy institute that will conduct research and development of clean coal and alternative energy technologies, and then implement those technologies on the Navajo Nation and in the region, thereby creating local industry and jobs, and local and regional economic and energy security. That is NTEC’s promise, all of which will be lost if the Project is not approved and the Navajo Mine and FCPP are shuttered. <b>If the preferred alternative is not selected, NTEC will wind up the affairs of the Mine, and its business will end.</b> These positive and critical impacts to the Navajo Nation from NTEC’s profits bolster the draft EIS and could be incorporated in the Final EIS, as should impacts from the alternative-ending NTEC’s tremendous promise by “killing coal” on the Navajo Nation.	Thank you for the comment. The DEIS describes that the tribal resolution establishing NTEC states that the purpose of purchasing the mine is to gain tribal control over the resources. It is our understanding from the tribal resolution that, if the preferred alternative is not selected, that there is the potential for future use of the mine. Clarifications received from NTEC on September 9, 2014 confirm that this comment did not imply that the mine does not have independent utility from the FCPP, and that future use of the mine in the event the preferred alternative is not selected would still be pursued.
279.010	Mr.	William	Kelly	NTEC		In creating NTEC, the Navajo Nation Council laid a path for a transition to cleaner energy technologies. Outside opposition groups say they want clean energy on the Navajo Nation but they do not provide the sourcing of capital or any real vision of what an energy transition on the Navajo Nation would look like, which the Navajo Nation through NTEC has developed. <b>The purchase of the Navajo Mine will give the Navajo Nation control of a large part of its coal resources and the associated natural environment, and an existing revenue flow from FCPP that will allow NTEC to explore emerging technologies, create jobs and a sustainable economy, and deliver more environmentally friendly outcomes for future generations of Navajo tribal members.</b> The proposals of the opposition groups, in contrast, are merely empty aspirations absent of any funding solutions, and simply center on closure of existing operations without providing future opportunities for jobs and socio-economic development on the Navajo Nation.	See response to comment 279.009

279.011	Mr.	William	Kelly	NTEC	06/26/14  C. OSM Properly Rejected Alternatives that Would Not Meet the Needs of the Navajo Nation and NTEC. The purpose and need for the Project correctly insures that the Navajo Nation, as a sovereign Indian nation, is able to shape its own economic future and develop its trust resources. In determining the purpose and need of an action, and the appropriate range of alternatives that must be considered in an EIS, the Tenth Circuit has explained that: Once an agency appropriately defines the objectives of an action, NEP A does not require agencies to analyze the environmental consequences of alternatives it has in good faith rejected as too remote, speculative, or impractical or ineffective. That is, once an agency establishes the objective of the proposed action-which it has considerable discretion to define-the agency need not provide a detailed study of alternatives that do not accomplish that purpose or objective, as those alternatives are not reasonable. However, agencies are not permitted to define the objectives of a proposed action so narrowly as to preclude a reasonable consideration of alternatives. For the alternatives selected for detailed analysis in the EIS, the agency must devote substantial treatment to each alternative including the proposed action so that reviewers may evaluate their comparative merits. Within the detailed alternatives analysis, agencies are also required to include the alternative of no action. For those alternatives which were eliminated from detailed study in the EIS-for example, because such alternatives do not further the defined purpose of the proposed action-the agency must briefly discuss the reasons for their having been eliminated. Wyoming v. United States Dept. of Agriculture, 661 F.3d 1209, 1244 ( 10th Cir. 2011) (internal citations, quotations and punctuation omitted) (emphasis added). OSM has met these NEP A requirements here. OSM correctly defines the purpose and need of the Project as (1) continuing to provide reliable electrical base-load power for FCPP customers, in part by (2) continuing to provide coal to FCPP, which comes exclusively from the Navajo Mine, (3) continuing to maintain grid and transmission reliability in the region for power originating from a range of sources, including hydro-electric and other renewables, and nuclear, and, critically, (4) ensuring tribal self-determination and economic development for affected Indian tribes, principally the Navajo Nation. See DEIS at 1-9. OSM was urged to consider converting FCPP to a natural gas, solar, wind, geothermal, biomass or even a solar/thermal/coal hybrid plant. OSM correctly determined that none of these alternatives meets the purpose and need of the Project, including securing the Navajo Nation’s rights to self-determination and economic development(Except for natural gas, these all also fail to provide the reliable electrical base load required to meet the objectives of the Project.) OSM also correctly determined that these alternatives were not economically feasible, and that several were not technically feasible, and that they therefore did not need to be carried forward for further analysis. See DEIS at 3-2 Table 3-1. An off-site coal supply would not use Navajo coal, would put NTEC out of business, and would require renegotiation of FCPP’s lease, and OSM was therefore correct to reject this alternative as well. Moreover, none of the rejected alternatives would be consistent with the Navajo Nation’s Energy Policy of 2013, which provides that “[t]he Nation promotes majority ownership	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision anticipated in the spring of 2015.
---------	-----	---------	-------	------	--	---

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						by the Nation or its entities of large-scale energy projects that utilize the Nation's resources in order to optimize the Nation's participation in profits," and that "[c]oal and coal-fired plants are a significant component of the Navajo economy and the Nation's revenues. The Nation will encourage a future in coal as a key component of the Nation's energy mix as a coal producer that delivers a significant amount of royalties, rent, fees, jobs and tax revenue from coal mining and production of electricity." See Exhibit 1, Ex. A, Sections 7, 9. Simply ending the development of the Navajo Nation's coal resources on the Navajo Nation does not meet the need and purpose of the Project, and was appropriately rejected by OSM.	
279.012	Mr.	William	Kelly	NTEC	06/26/14	The balance of the Indian Trust Assets analysis should also carry forward the context of the Project, and not treat the Project as generic development of Indian trust assets by non-tribal entities, discussing only whether the tribe is getting its due for royalties from coal sales and not suffering undue environmental costs. The federal government certainly has the responsibility to make that analysis as a fiduciary of the Navajo Nation's land and resources. However, here, the Navajo Nation, as a tribal sovereign with a right to self-determination and economic independence, has made a decision to develop its own trust resources. The Navajo Nation is the resource owner and the seller. The analysis and discussion should thus acknowledge and emphasize further the unique character and context of this Project, and the federal government's trust obligation, in accordance with federal policy, to ensure the Navajo Nation is able to develop and sell the resources that are at stake in this proceeding. See, e.g., the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act of 2005, 25 U.S.C. § 3501-04 (enacted as Title V of the Energy Policy Act of 2005), at § 3502 (the general purpose of the Act is "[t]o assist Indian tribes in the development of energy resources and further the goal of Indian self-determination" in the development of tribal energy resources). The Navajo Nation is not merely getting royalties from the extraction and sale of the coal, but it is directly getting revenues from the coal sales as well, which could be added to the Indian Trust Assets analysis.	The following has been added to page 4.12-1 in Section 4.12.1: It is important to note that the Navajo Nation, as a tribal sovereign with a right to self-determination and economic independence, has decided to develop its own trust resources, through the approval of NTEC within Navajo Nation legislation. The Navajo Nation is thus the resource owner and seller. The federal government's trust obligation, in accordance with federal policy, is to assist Indian tribes, like the Navajo Nation, in the development of energy resources and further the goal of Indian self-determination. See Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-Determination Act of 2005 (25 U.S.C. §3501-04).
279.013	Mr.	William	Kelly	NTEC	06/26/14	The Navajo Nation is now the owner and leaseholder of the tribal trust assets at issue (The Navajo Mine is continuing the coal distribution program under NTEC ownership, see DEIS at 4.11-12, although NTEC will be looking at teaming with Navajo Nation agencies to introduce alternative stoves and heating methods for the Navajo people that are safer for indoor use. This could be clarified in the Final EIS.).	The paragraph has been amended as follows: OSMRE completed an EA evaluating the proposed action of the transfer of the SMCRA permit from BNCC to NTEC. The EA analyzed the environmental justice effects of this action. The analysis found that some programs formerly offered by BNCC, such as the employee coal distribution program at Navajo Mine, do not formally transfer to NTEC, and it is not clear whether NTEC will continue this program now that the permit has been transferred, or if NTEC will expand the program. Therefore, the potential indirect impacts associated with the assets and liabilities assumed by the Navajo Nation were found to not disproportionately impact the low-income, minority, and Tribal populations within the ROI.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
279.014	Mr.	William	Kelly	NTEC	06/26/14	As OSM correctly analyzed in the DEIS, the principal environmental justice community of concern for the Project is the Navajo Nation, as a federally recognized Indian tribe, and it is with the Navajo Nation’s leaders that OSM is obligated to consult for environmental justice issues affecting the Navajo Nation and its members, <b>on a government-to-government basis....</b> See DEIS at 4.11-12 (“The action of the Tribal Council is an expression by the affected community that investment in Navajo Mine by the Navajo Nation would meet its goals of controlling the mineral resource and providing stable employment for members.”); “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations,” Executive Order 12898, Sec. 6-606 (Feb. 11, 1994) (“[T]he Department of the Interior, in coordination with the Working Group, and, after consultation with tribal leaders, shall coordinate steps to be taken pursuant to this order that address Federally-recognized Indian Tribes.”) (emphasis added); <b>Executive Order 13175, Sec. 3 (Nov. 6, 2000) (when “implementing policies that have tribal implications ... [a]gencies shall respect Indian tribal self-government and sovereignty, honor tribal treaty and other tights, and strive to meet the responsibilities that arise from the unique legal relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribal governments.”)</b> ; id. Sec. 2 (“Fundamental Principles” that “[t]he United States continues to work with Indian tribes on a government-to-government basis to address issues concerning Indian tribal self-government, tribal trust resources, and Indian tribal treaty and other tights [and] ... recognizes the right of Indian tribes to self-government and supports tribal sovereignty and self-determination.”).	The provided information has been added to the introduction portion of section 4.11.
279.015	Mr.	William	Kelly	NTEC	06/26/14	Additionally, based on guidance from EPA’s National Environmental Justice Advisory Council, OSM cites specifically to the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. That Declaration provides that, under international law, indigenous peoples have an “inherent right to self-determination” and that “[ a]greements must be reached with the full participation of authorized leaders, representatives or decision-making institutions as decided by the indigenous peoples themselves.” DEIS at 4.11-13 (emphasis added).	Thank you for your comment.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
279.016	Mr.	William	Kelly	NTEC	06/26/14	The Navajo Nation is overwhelmingly in support of the Project as expressed through its elected leaders. See supra. Accordingly, there are no adverse environmental justice impacts to the Navajo Nation's resources, including its grazing lands, stock ponds, cultural resources, visual resources, human resources, recreational resources, etc. from the Project, and OSM could clarify this in the Final EIS. Compare, e.g., DEIS at 4.11-16, 4.11-17, 4.11-18, 4.11-19, 4.11-20, 4.11-21, 4.11-24. Thus there cannot be adverse environmental justice impacts to a single Navajo tribal member (which would be immaterial in any event). Compare DEIS at 4.11-22. There also cannot be any adverse environmental justice impacts to Navajo agricultural production and the Navajo food supply. Compare DEIS at 4.11-26.12 This could be clarified by OSM in the Final EIS.	The support of the elected leadership of the Navajo Nation is noted. In accordance with E.O 12898, environmental justice must be evaluated in accordance with NEPA guidelines. The position of the Navajo Nation government is presented on pages 4.11-11 and 4.11-12 of the Draft EIS. The following sentence has been added to page 4.11-12: <u>The Navajo Nation has the authority to discontinue operations of the Navajo Mine and also decided to approve Lease Amendment #3 for the FCPP. The Navajo Nation government representatives are elected by tribal members in a democratic process; thereby, decisions of the Navajo Nation government are considered representative of the tribe (the environmental justice community of concern for this project).</u>
279.017	Mr.	William	Kelly	NTEC	06/26/14	In contrast, as to the no-action alternative, OSM could additionally clarify that the impacts to the environmental justice community would not only be "major," as OSM correctly determines based on economic factors, see DEIS at 4.11-38, but catastrophic, in a host of other way. If the no-action alternative is selected by OSM, the environmental justice community of concern will be prevented, by the federal government, from exercising its sovereignty and self-determination as an indigenous people.	Thank you for your comment. Catastrophic is not a NEPA term. OSMRE is considering all alternatives and will publish its decision in the Record of Decision for the project, anticipated in spring 2015.
279.018	Mr.	William	Kelly	NTEC	06/26/14	If the no-action alternative is selected by OSM, the environmental justice community of concern will be prevented, by the federal government, from developing its tribal trust resources reserved to it under the Treaty of 1868. If the no-action alternative is selected by OSM, the environmental justice community of concern will lose, by decision of the federal government, the tremendous promise of NTEC to transition the Navajo Nation into energy and economic security and prosperity.	The following language has been added to Section 4.11.8.5: <u>Further, the environmental justice community of concern would be prevented from developing its tribal trust resources reserved to it under the Treaty of 1868.</u>
280.001	Mr.	Jim	Judge			No substantive comment	Thank you for your comment.
281.001	Dr.	James	Henderson	Four corners Economic Development, Inc.	07/20/14	2000 jobs and \$150 million in payroll will be lost by failure to adopt this alternative and is more than our community can afford	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomic impacts of the project is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
282.001	Ms.	Janet	Tucker		06/26/14	No substantive comment	Thank you for your comment.
283.001	Ms.	Karen	Vitulano	USEPA	06/30/14	The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the above-referenced document pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and our NEPA review authority under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. Our detailed comments are enclosed. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) assesses the impacts from the continued operation of the Four Corners Power Plant (FCPP), a coal-fired power plant with a generating capacity of up to 1,500 megawatts (2 units), should the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) approve Arizona Public Service Company's proposed lease amendment	The concerns noted by the EPA are addressed in specific, detailed comments that their letter provided. We also appreciate the opinions regarding the sufficiency of the draft EIS; we believe that responses to these concerns provides the EPA with sufficient information for their NPDES permit actions, to be informed in part by this EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p>and application for right-of-way renewals for operation through 2041. The project also involves continued and extended surface coal mining at the Navajo Mine, should the Office of Surface Mining (OSM) renew the Navajo Mine's existing Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (SMCRA) permit for 5 years and approve an application for a new SMCRA permit for the Pinabete Permit Area. Lastly, the project proposes right-of-way renewals by BIA for portions of four transmission lines. EPA is a cooperating agency for the proposed project and provided comments on the Preliminary DEIS to the OSM and BIA on February 6, 2014. We found the DEIS to be largely responsive to our comments, and appreciate the changes made to the document to address them. Comments that were not fully addressed are reiterated in the attached Detailed Comments. Based on our review of the DEIS, we have rated the Preferred Alternative A as Environmental Concerns – Insufficient Information (EC-2) (see enclosed "Summary of Rating Definitions"). Our concerns regard the existing contamination of groundwater from coal combustion residue (CCR) disposal and the need for enforceable commitments regarding future CCR management, monitoring and remediation. We also have concerns regarding the assessment of cumulative health impacts from continued operation of the project, given the severely compromised existing public health environment. Pollutants from the disposal of CCR have contaminated groundwater at the FCPP. The DEIS includes a number of voluntary measures to be taken by Arizona Public Service (APS) regarding operations, design, groundwater monitoring, corrective action, and closure and post-closure of CCR disposal facilities at the FCPP. Because future regulations by EPA regarding CCR management may not apply on Tribal lands, we strongly recommend that the voluntary measures be incorporated as conditions of approval by the BIA in the event it approves APS's proposed lease amendment and application for right-of-way renewals. Groundwater contamination from past disposal of CCR in Navajo Mine has also occurred and we recommend monitoring of groundwater at the Navajo Mine to confirm the DEIS conclusions that constituents of concern would be attenuated as groundwater travels towards the San Juan River and the Chaco Rivers. The DEIS concludes that that cumulative impacts to public health from both the FCPP and the Mine would be minor. Emissions of some pollutants from the power plant will be reduced as a result of EPA's Federal Implementation Plan - Best Available Retrofit Technology, and these reductions are expected to have a positive impact on public health. Nevertheless, as disclosed in the DEIS, health outcomes for Navajo, in term of life expectancy and mortality rates, are worse than for the general population in San Juan County, partly due to healthcare disparities. The cumulative health burden also includes the impacts from in-home burning of coal that is provided by the Navajo Mine to local tribal members free or at low-cost. This coal is often burned in improperly-vented stoves not designed to burn coal. Because many Navajo do not have access, or affordable access, to electricity, the provision of free or cheap coal by the project directly contributes to the cumulative health burden from indoor exposure to coal smoke. We</p>	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						recommend that the Final EIS incorporate the severely compromised existing public health environment into its cumulative health impacts assessment and include commitments to mitigation for the project's contribution to the ongoing environmental justice and cumulative health impacts. Please see the enclosed Detailed Comments for our recommendations regarding mitigation. EPA appreciates the opportunity to review this DEIS and looks forward to continued coordination with OSM, BIA, and the other cooperating agencies during the NEPA process. When the Final EIS is released for public review, please send one copy to the address above (mail code: CED-2). If you have any questions, please contact me at (415) 972-3521, or contact Karen Vitulario, the lead reviewer for this project, at 415-947-4178 or vitulano.karen@epa.gov.	
284.001	Mr.	Jim	Pratt	SRP		<p>SRP has reviewed the DEIS and, based on consultation with Arizona Public Service the FCPP operator, recommends that OSMRE and the cooperating agencies select and implement Alternative D -Alternate Ash Disposal Area Configuration . We submit the following specific comments for your consideration.</p> <p>Comments on Issues of Concern to SRP and Proposed Revisions</p> <p>Executive Summary, p. ES-ii - At least the first time the Salt River Project is referred to, the full name should be used -Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District followed by "(Salt River Project)," which is used subsequently in the DEIS.</p> <p>Project Background, p. 1-2- In addition to doing so in the Executive Summary, SRP recommends that OSMRE use the full name of Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District the first time it is referred to, followed by "Salt River Project."</p> <p>Associated Transmission Lines Operations, P- 2-31 -The first sentence on the page should be revised to reflect that SCE no longer uses any of the capacity on the 500-kV line to Moenkopi (and there is just one line, not multiple lines).</p> <p>The fenced switchyard is described as occupying 20 acres within the 212 acre ROW. Research by SRP indicates the fenced switchyard is 25 acres.</p>	Thank you for your comments. OSMRE is considering all alternatives and will publish its decision in the Record of Decision for the project, anticipated in spring 2015. With regard to the technical revisions, the FEIS has been revised accordingly, including revision of the cumulative effects analysis, as appropriate.
284.002	Mr.	Jim	Pratt	SRP		<p>The Navajo Generating Station (NGS) participants (The NGS Participants include Arizona Public Service, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, Nevada Energy, Salt River Project, Tucson Electric Power, and the United States) and Navajo Nation have agreed to the terms of a proposed amendment to the existing lease that covers the NGS and related facilities, including the Moenkopi Switchyard and the transmission line from there to the Reservation boundary. Also, SRP, on behalf of the NGS participants is applying to the BIA for 323 grants for these facilities to be effective through 12/22/2044. The approvals for the lease and 323 grants for these facilities is part of the NEPA process for NGS-KMC Project currently in scoping. We suggest adding this additional information to the Final EIS for the FCPP.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Information regarding the Section 323 grants has been added to Table 4.18-1 as follows:</p> <p>"The NGS applicants have also agreed to terms with the Navajo Nation to amend the existing NGS lease to include the Moenkopi switchyard (not substation) and a transmission line running from the switchyard to the Reservation boundary. The NGS applicants have filed Section 323 ROW grant requests to BIA for review. If the approvals are not granted, the power plant would shut down in 2019 and the Section 323 grants would not be authorized."</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
284.003	Mr.	Jim	Pratt	SRP	06/26/14	Based on <a href="http://www.epa.gov/region9/air/navajo/pdfs/ngs-supp-factsheet-sept25.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/region9/air/navajo/pdfs/ngs-supp-factsheet-sept25.pdf</a> , which is EPA's most recent fact sheet for NGS, we suggest the first highlighted phrase above be changed to read "over 84 percent." Also, we suggest changing the second highlighted phrase to "more than 95 percent" based on <a href="http://www.ngspower.com/facts.aspx">http://www.ngspower.com/facts.aspx</a> . Finally, "NGS 2013" is listed as a reference for the sentences but is not listed in the reference section. We suggest that it be replaced with references to the documents referred to in the web sites listed above.	Air Quality data incorporated into the EIS were accumulated and analyzed with data through 2011; therefore, some data identified in the comment are not included. Because the analyses were performed on 12 years of representative performance data, the EIS will not be updated to include more recent data.
284.004	Mr.	Jim	Pratt	SRP	06/26/14	<p>Projects Considered in the Cumulative Effects Analysis, p. 4.18-4- The description of NGS is for full 2,250 MW operation from 2020 through 2044. EPA is expected to issue a final NGS BART determination in the summer of 2014 prior to finalization of the FCPP EIS. These entries should be revised in the FEIS to reflect the range of NGS operations provided for under the EPA's final rule. SRP anticipates EPA will adopt as an alternative for BART the Technical Work Group (TWG) Agreement, which can be found at: <a href="http://www.ngspower.com/twg.aspx">http://www.ngspower.com/twg.aspx</a>. The EPA's supplemental BART proposal incorporating the TWG Agreement can be found at: <a href="http://www.nqspower.com/pdfx/TWG/NGS%20Supplemental%20Proposal%20prepublication.pdf">http://www.nqspower.com/pdfx/TWG/NGS Supplemental Proposal prepublication.pdf</a></p> <p>Unless EPA issues a final rule that does not contain the TWG Agreement provisions, we suggest adding the following text to the NGS Project Description:</p> <p>To comply with EPA's BART determination, the NGS participants would operate under one of two overall alternatives depending on the disposition of ownership in NGS:</p> <p>Alternative A. Cease coal generation on one unit or reduce generation by January 1, 2020. Install SCR or an equivalent technology by December 31, 2030 on both remaining units.</p> <p>Alternative B. Reduce NOx emissions by an amount equivalent to the shutdown of one unit from 2020 to 2030. Submit an annual plan that would describe the measures to be used to achieve greater NOx reductions than EPA's proposed BART rule. The reduced NOx emissions could be achieved by various combinations of measures ranging from curtailment of output from three units to full operation of three units with installation of SCRs prior to 2030.</p> <p>Also, SRP should be spelled out as Salt River Project since the acronym is not used elsewhere.</p>	Thank you for your comment. The description of Navajo Generating Station remains as described in the Draft EIS. Alternative operation scenarios for the NGS are outside the scope of the cumulative impact analysis. The abbreviation for SRP has been corrected.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
284.005	Mr.	Jim	Pratt	SRP		<p>Projects Considered in the Cumulative Effects Analysis, p. 4.18-17 -The Project Description for the Kayenta Mining Complex (KMC) should be modified to reflect the information in the preceding comment regarding the TWG Agreement. Coal production will be reduced to about 5.5 million tons per year if NGS generation is reduced to the equivalent of two units.</p> <p>Projects Considered in the Cumulative Effects Analysis, p. 4.18-20 -The KMC entry regarding the Black Mesa Mine and Mohave Generating Station should be deleted. Alternatively, it could be completely revised to reflect that the Mohave Generating Station has been demolished and the coal slurry pipeline is being abandoned.</p> <p>Figure 4.18-1 Project Boundaries Map, p. 4.18-33 -There are several orange lines (mining-related per the legend) leading from the Kayenta Mine (#28) on the map. Presumably, these reflect the Black Mesa slurry and proposed C-aquifer water supply lines. If so, they should be removed from the map because the slurry line is being abandoned and the proposed water supply lines are no longer needed. The legend entry for #28 should read "Kayenta Mine Complex."</p>	With regard to Black Mesa Mine and Mohave, the table has been revised to indicate that the station is demolished. The table already indicates that the project is not considered in the cumulative effects analysis. The orange lines extending from the Kayenta Mine Complex have been removed from Figure 4.18-1 and the legend for entry #28 has been changed to "Kayenta Mine Complex"
284.006	Ms.	Michele	Maser	SRP		<p>Hazardous and Solid Wastes, pp. 4.18-52 to 53 -The last sentence concludes that there are moderate to major cumulative impacts from ash disposal. The analysis is not accurate -first, the KMC mine does not involve ash disposal and is not within the same groundwater basin as the FCPP. Also, NGS is not within the same groundwater basin as the FCPP. In addition, given the discussion of groundwater hydrology in the area in Sections 4.5 and 4.18.3.5, there is no reason to believe that possible leaching from the San Juan Generating Station ash disposal would have a cumulative effect with potential leaching from FCPP ash disposal.</p>	The text has been revised as follows: Only one of the three coal-fired power plants in the region, San Juan Generating Station, is of similar capacity as the FCPP and is located within the same groundwater basin. Therefore, it is anticipated that a similar volume of CCR would be generated at this plant and require disposal or impoundment. In contrast, Escalante Generating Station only produces 250 MW and is expected to produce a much smaller volume of CCR; neither Escalante Generating Station nor Navajo Generating Station are located within the San Juan River groundwater basin.
285.001	Mr.	Vincent H.	Yazzie		06/26/14	<p>Four Corners Power Plant Navajo Mine Energy Project Draft EIS says solar energy is not feasible, but Lucky Corridor Transmission Project will deliver renewable energy via Four Corners to Western Markets. <a href="http://www.wecc.biz/planning/transmissionexpansion/transmission/Lists/Project%55&amp;Source=http://www.wecc.biz/Planning/TransmissionExpansion/Transmission/Pages/default.aspx">http://www.wecc.biz/planning/transmissionexpansion/transmission/Lists/Project%55&amp;Source=http://www.wecc.biz/Planning/TransmissionExpansion/Transmission/Pages/default.aspx</a> Solar is feasible and the study to say solar was not feasible was not correct.</p> <p>The Lucky Corridor Lucky Corridor Independent Electricity Transmission Projects View on <a href="http://www.luckycorridor.com">www.luckycorridor.com</a> Preview by Yahoo Need to correct EIS to say solar is feasible as an alternative.</p>	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives
286.001	Mr.	Ward	Salveson		06/26/14	No substantive comment	Thank you for your comment.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
287.001	Mr.	Bradley	Watson		5/2/2014	I think economically the mine, the power plant, also helps out the county-wide and also with the Navajo Nation as a whole and also the San Juan County, the city of Aztec, Farmington, Bloomfield, Shiprock, Durango, and Cortez and those areas too.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10, Socioeconomics.
287.002	Mr.	Bradley	Watson		5/2/2014	Environmentally, I think Four Corners Power Plant could do a lot better with their ash disposal. Right now, I have big concerns with where they deposit their ash. • It's all on the west side of the power plant and it's just big old mounds, and then come spring we have our high winds and you just see a big old gray plumb of ash going down into the valley.	The majority of ash disposal at the FCPP over the life of the project will be dry ash disposal—the dry fly ash disposal area configurations in both the Alternative D and the Proposed Action involve the disposal of dry ash. The EIS provides information regarding FCPP dust control procedures: “During placement of CCR, compaction control, added moisture, and slope control are used, as well as dust suppressant and periodic fabric covering of slopes... The fly ash has high moisture content when transported and unloaded by the haul trucks. Over time, it dries into a cement-like solid. Surfactant is applied regularly to reduce the amount of fugitive dust that can become airborne during triggering wind events.” No change was made to the EIS based on this comment.
287.003	Mr.	Bradley	Watson		5/2/2014	I see that there is weather station set up here, but some places they're not set in the right places and not exactly in the downwind of the power plants or the ash. And sometimes I can't even see the smoke stack of the power plant because the ash is blowing so high. I think they could do a better job as far as helping minimize a lot of that ash blowing in the wind.	Thank you for your comment. The existing weather stations do not monitor dust that may come from the ash disposal areas, or any source of fugitive emissions. The EIS addresses applicant proposed measures for limiting the amount of dust that escapes from the DFADAs. See comment 287.002 for more detail on proposed measures to decrease fugitive dust from the proposed DFADAs. No change was made to the EIS based on this comment.
287.004	Mr.	Bradley	Watson			As far as water, I don't know what they will do with the water situation as far as after disturbance occurs. There is a lot of areas around here that people depend on, say, subsurface waterflows. And when they mine through it, what is going to happen? • Right now the mine is coming south from Area III and they're cutting across the wash. • What kind of disturbance is going to happen? • After reclamation is done, are they going to -- I don't know, what are they going to do with the water, is what I want to say. •	Thank you for your comment. Water resources and potential effects to hydrology are discussed in Section 4.5. As stated on page 4.5-10, well yields in the alluvium within the Pinabete permit area are limited. Similarly, groundwater production and yield in the Fruitland Formation and Pictured Cliffs Sandstone, and exploratory drilling has not produced measurable groundwater.
288.001	Mr.	Larry	Bryant		06/29/14	There is also a huge economic impact to the Navajo Nation and the surrounding area that must be considered and preserved.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
289.001	Ms.	Angela	Mack		06/27/14	The mine and it's employees support the local community and make the area a better place to live. The reclamation standards of the Navajo Mine far surpass the national standards.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
290.001	Mr.	Brian	Cornford	FCI Constructors, Inc.	06/20/14	We strongly agree with and encourage Alternative A as proposed by APS and BHP Billiton, by choosing this option it would promote growth to San Juan county and the surrounding area, as well as save jobs, the environment, and ultimately save all parties money.	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.
291.001	Mr.	Cory	Darrell		06/27/14	No substantive comment	Thank you for your comment.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
292.001	Mr.	Jimbo	Buickerood		06/27/14	Despite the seemingly enormous energy and finances put into this EIS it is sorely deficient on many points and it is very evident that contrary to law the EIS did not address all the salient issues delineated by the public in the scoping process. The EIS is sufficiently deficient that it should be scrapped and rewritten. The EIS has erroneously and illegally narrowed it's scope to power generation and transmission produced only by coal - the EIS should have addressed ALL possible electrical power generation possibilities because that is indeed the issue at hand that is most important to the tribes, other residents of the Four Corners, the entire American populace, and indeed the planetary population considering the mal-effects of coal generated electricity	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis and Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives.
292.002	Mr.	Jimbo	Buickerood		06/27/14	The EIS's Biological Assessment is completely unacceptable and represents a document written without key interests/authors at the table. The results of this approach are akin to not writing a BA as part of the EIS. The effects of carbon pollution, a position to most species of the planet, is not adequately addressed in the EIS. A realistic and comprehensive analysis of the carbon pollution is necessary and required and the EIS is not valid until this issue is adequately addressed.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis. With specific regard to the biological assessment, this evaluation was conducted in close coordination with the USFWS as part of the Section 7 consultation process for the project.
292.003	Mr.	Jimbo	Buickerood		06/27/14	Residents of the aware are "tired" of haze, air pollutants, climate damage and other map-affects from coal-fired power plants. We want to be able to eat the fish in our rivers and lakes with a healthy confidence, and we will be able to do some should an adequate EIS be prepared that shows in ENTIRETY the negative effects of the FCPP and associated facilities.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
293.001	Mr.	Josiah	Meck		06/27/14	No substantive comment	Thank you for your comment
294.001	Ms.	Kasra	Manavi		06/27/14	1. After reviewing the material, I felt there could be better break downs or highlights made in the EIS. The document itself seems very daunting to read, perhaps a condensed version should be made with the major features and have supplemental materials with the rest of the information/data/graphs/etc.	The Executive Summary is a brief summary of the important components of the Draft EIS, and is meant to be able to read and understood as a stand-alone document. As such, all information in the ES is copied verbatim from sections in the Draft EIS. In addition, a summary video was produced in English, Navajo, and Hopi to convey the information in the EIS to non-English speakers, or to those wishing an alternate to reading the document.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
294.002	Ms.	Kasra	Manavi		06/27/14	2. Short term and long term gains and losses generally focus on the socioeconomic factors of the project. Discussion of the No Action alternative seems a little inflated since the focus is only the mine, making me feel the topic is not thoroughly discussed. Perhaps this may not be considered part of the job for OSMRE, but some other organization like Navajo Transitional Energy Company (NTEC). From the reading, I assume the EIS is not intended to focus on other resources for energy production, but never the less there should be some information/discussion about the No Action alternative.	Per CEQ regulations for implementing NEPA, all alternatives must be analyzed to the same level of detail, as conducted in the draft EIS. The full scope of each alternative, including analyzing the shutdown of FCPP as part of the No Action alternative, was included in the DEIS. All alternatives, including the No Action, were analyzed for local and regional economic effects in equal detail. When compared to the other action alternatives, the No Action alternative is unique in the sense that it involves the closure, not continued operations, of the existing facilities (i.e. FCPP and Navajo Mine). As discussed in Section 4.10, the No Action alternative represents the only alternative that could result in a significant adverse economic effect vis a vis the loss of approximately 2,070 direct/indirect jobs and revenues (i.e. taxes, royalties) to the Navajo Nation. These losses would have a ripple effect throughout the local and regional economies, as modeled and discussed in Section 4.10.
295.001	Ms.	Marjorie	Connolly		06/27/14	No substantive comment	Thank you for your comment
296.001	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	06/27/14	<p>Chapters 1 and 3; General Comment regarding Description of the “Project”: The DEIS defines the “Project” as the four primary federal actions in several sections, and acknowledges that the “Proposed Action” includes other lease renewal and permit approval processes by the cooperating agencies. For the sake of completeness, MMCo recommends including all proposed federal actions in the discussion of the Project, or, in the alternative, providing a list of the other lease renewal and permit issuance processes immediately following the definition of “Proposed Action,” as the DEIS has done for the “Project.” For example, in Chapter 1, Section 1, Page 1-1, Paragraph 1, the DE IS defines the four primary actions as the “Project.” Chapter 1 includes a subsequent discussion of the other elements of the Project in Table 1-1 and at pages 1-11 to 1-12. For completeness, the initial discussion of the “Project” should be expanded to include all federal actions, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bureau of Land Management’s (BLM) action on the Pinabete Permit Area Resource Recovery and Protection Plan (R2P2) application;</li> <li>• BLM’s action on Public Service Company of New Mexico’s (PNM) Four Corners Power Plant (FCPP) West Mesa transmission line application;</li> <li>• US Army Corps of Engineer’s (USACOE) action on MMCo’s application for an individual permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act;</li> <li>• U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) action on MMCo’s NPDES application for the Navajo Mine and Pinabete Permit Area under Section 402 of the Clean Water Act;</li> <li>• Proposed future realignment of Burnham Road (with formal application anticipated in 2022); and</li> <li>• BIA’s action on Navajo Transitional Energy Company, LLC’s (NTEC) application seeking renewal of three ROWs for Navajo Mine Access Roads. Chapter 3, Page 3-1, lists the Proposed Action’s four main components.</li> </ul>	The Draft EIS already states “Proposed Action in this EIS also includes the completion of the various lease renewal approval and permit processes by the cooperating agencies with jurisdiction over the project.” An R2P2 is a document related to Federal coal leasing, and does not apply in the context of Indian coal leasing. The functional equivalent of the R2P2 for coal leasing on Indian lands is the mine plan. No change has been made to the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.002	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	06/27/14	While the remaining components of the Proposed Action are discussed elsewhere in Chapter 3, for completeness, please provide the list of the other proposed actions in this initial discussion. Similarly, in Chapter 3, each of the alternatives' discussions includes a discussion of the Project's main components, but should also include a discussion of all federal actions associated with that alternative. For example, the alternatives' discussion should include a discussion regarding MMCo's application for a Clean Water Act Section 404 Individual Permit, MMCo's NPDES permit application, the applications pending before the BIA for the three access road renewals, as well as BLM action on NTEC's R2P2, and BLM's action on the transmission line ROW renewal.	The regulatory setting governing the alternatives are summarized within each resource category discussion. An R2P2 is a document related to Federal coal leasing, and does not apply in the context of Indian coal leasing. The functional equivalent of the R2P2 for coal leasing on Indian lands is the mine plan.
296.003	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	06/27/14	Similarly, we suggest clarifying throughout the FEIS that, for certain actions, the action agency has the authority to approve, approve with conditions, or disapprove the action. For example, with respect to NTEC's proposed Pinabete Permit Application, OSMRE may approve, approve with conditions, or disapprove the Pinabete SMCRA Permit Application to allow coal mining activities.	Please see Master Response #12, Placement of Conditions on Permit and Lease
296.004	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	06/27/14	<p>While not technically "proposed actions," OSM could also consider identifying in consistent fashion the various roles of entities involved in formal consultation roles under applicable statutory and regulatory schemes in Table 1-1 of Chapter 1. The DEIS describes those roles in various sections, but it might be helpful to outline those roles at the outset in Table 1-1. The DEIS identifies OSM as the lead agency, and, as the lead agency, OSM is tasked with consultation under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act and Section 1 06 of the National Historic Preservation Act, on its own behalf and as lead agency. All of the other action agencies, however, will also participate in the ESA and NHPA consultations. While Table 1-1 describes some of these consultation roles, it does not include all. Thus, we recommend revising Table 1-1 to ensure that following roles are identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The BIA is participating in the ESA Section 7 and NHPA consultations, along with OSM, regarding APS' Proposed Lease Amendment No. 3, NTEC's proposed Burnham Road realignment, as well as the proposed access road right-of-way renewals and transmission line right-of-way renewals.</li> <li>• The BLM is participating in the ESA Section 7 and NHPA consultations, along with OSM, regarding the PNM rights-of-way renewal for which it is the action agency.</li> <li>• The USACOE is participating in the ESA Section 7 and NHPA consultations, along with OSM, regarding MMCo's Clean Water Act Section 404 permit application.</li> <li>• The EPA is participating in the ESA Section 7 and NHPA consultations, along with OSM, regarding NTEC's NPDES permit application.</li> <li>• The Navajo Nation is participating in the ESA Section 7 and NHPA consultations, along with OSM.</li> </ul>	Thank you for your comment.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Hopi Tribe is participating in the ESA Section 7 and NHPA consultations, along with OSM.</li> <li>• The National Park Service is participating in the ESA Section 7 and NHPA consultations, along with OSM. •</li> </ul>	
296.005	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	06/27/14	<p>These same changes should be made in Chapter 1 text. For example, Section 1.4.2.1, which describes the BIA's actions, should include a discussion of BIA's role in the ESA and NHPA consultations. Section 1.4.2.2, which describes the BLM's actions, should include a discussion of the BLM's role in the ESA and NHPA consultations. Section 1.4.2.3, which describes the USACOE's action, should include a discussion of USACOE's role in the ESA and NHPA consultations. Section 1.4.2.4, which describes the EPA's actions should include a discussion of EPA's role in the ESA and NHPA consultations. The Navajo Nation, the Hopi Tribe, and the National Park Service are involved in both the ESA and the NHPA consultations, and sections 1.4.2.6, 1.4.2.7, and 1.4.2.8 should be changed to reflect each entities respective roles. Alternatively, the EIS should be clear that OSM has been acting as the lead agency on behalf of the other federal agencies in fulfilling agency roles in these consultation and compliance efforts.</p>	Thank you for your comment.
296.006	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	06/27/14	<p>Chapter 2, Current Operations; General Comment regarding Section 2.1: Recognizing that a document such as an EIS cannot always be completely up to date as activities unrelated to the Proposed Action continue, MMCo would observe that as of June 31, 2013, as reported in BHP Navajo Coal Company's (BNCC) Fiscal Year 2013 Navajo Mine Annual Report, approximately 366 acres had been disturbed in the area permitted under OSMRE's March 2012 approval of the SMCRA permit revision for Navajo Mine. Also, for completeness, OSM may wish to include reference to the pending Dine CARE v. OSM suit that challenges OSM's National Environmental Policy Act compliance effort associated with its March 2012 decision to revise the Navajo Mine SMCRA permit to authorizing mining activities in the northern part of Area IV North, in what is part of the preexisting Navajo Mine SMCRA Permit Area. The record shows that OSM prepared a comprehensive 233 page Environmental Assessment as part of its compliance work prior to approving the March 2012 permit revision.</p>	Changed Table 2-1 to indicate 366 acres disturbed.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.007	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	06/27/14	The DEIS identifies in various places the expected impacts from each of the alternatives. Chapter 3 includes tables that provide a comparison of impacts of the alternatives, for example Tables 3-8 to -10. These tables adequately set forth the comparison of disturbance area, but could also be expanded upon, for example, to include a comparison of the estimated number of cultural or paleontological sites that could be affected. As mentioned above, this information is contained in the DEIS, for example Chapter 4 includes tables summarizing impacts on cultural resources by alternative, and Chapter 5 includes a discussion of impacts by alternative. However, compiling this information in the tables in Chapter 3 may be useful for the reader.	Thank you for your comments. OSMRE has considered the proposed revisions and determined that they would not affect any of the analyses or conclusions presented in the EIS. No change has been made to the Draft EIS.
296.008	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	06/27/14	The estimated total production of 134 M tons needed would be mined using a combination of both the Navajo Mine SMCRA Permit area and the proposed Pinabete Permit Area. In certain sections, the DEIS overstates the amount of coal to be produced. For Example, in the ITA section, the text on page 4.12-4 should be marmonized with table 3-5 and all calculations in section 4.12 should be refined to incorporate the decreased production rate at Navajo Mine. MMCo requests that the estimated decreased production be described consistently throughout the FEIS.	Changes made
296.009	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	06/27/14	Chapter 3 of the DEIS accurately and comprehensively describes the No Action Alternative. The various resource sections, however, are not always consistent with the description of the No Action Alternative provided in Chapter 3. MMCo recommends consistency among all resource sections. The various discussions of the No Action Alternative appear to focus primarily on its on-the-ground implications. While touched on in the draft, OSM should consider whether the final EIS should more comprehensively in one location - perhaps in Chapter 3 - discuss all impacts, both "positive" and "negative." Additionally, each resource section should include a discussion of all impacts associated with the No Action Alternative. For example, the cessation of mining would result in the end of important royalty and tribal tax payments to the Navajo Nation from Navajo Mine operations. The loss of the royalty and tax payment streams from these operations would have serious negative implications for the Navajo Nation and its ability to provide governmental services to its members and otherwise pursue its self-determination policies	The Draft EIS assesses both the "footprint" effects and the potential social effects of the No Action alternative. The No Action alternative was adhered to consistently throughout all the resource area analyses. For example, Section 4.10.4.5 includes a clear disclosure of the potential economic financial effects of selecting the No Action alternative.  The Draft EIS also assesses both potentially adverse and beneficial effects. See response to comment 307.154. Tables ES-11 and 3-12 also includes a comparison of the effects from each alternative, allowing for a central and comprehensive analysis of the alternatives.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.010	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	06/27/14	While employment at Navajo Mine may not be dramatically impacted initially following “no action” decisions by the federal agencies, revenues and benefits flowing to mine employees would clearly be impacted in the long term: Instead of continuing to mine and contemporaneously reclaim lands for the period from 2016 through 2031, after which final reclamation work would proceed (unless a new coal supply contract is put in place for the period after 2031 ), the final reclamation effort would start immediately in the 2015-2017 time frame, depending on whether NTEC can continue to mine and deliver coal to the FCPP until its lease expires in 2016. Consequently, under the No Action Alternative, mine employees, their families, and the communities in which they live, work and invest or spend their hard earned income would not enjoy the 15 or more years of prosperity they would otherwise if the Proposed Action was fully implemented.	Thank you for your comment. Please see Section 4.10.4.5 for a discussion of the potential effects to the local economy if the No Action is selected.
296.011	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	06/27/14	In the short term, however, under the No Action Alternative, there will be changes in employment patterns and responsibilities if NTEC does not identify another customer. Specifically, those employees that had been involved in coal mining and production efforts would likely be re-tasked to pursue final reclamation work.	Section 4.10.4.5 has been amended to include the following language: While it is recognized that a portion of existing FCPP and Navajo Mine employees would be re-tasked for abandonment and reclamation activities, these assignments would likely only last a few years after shutdown and ultimately render the loss of 2,070 jobs.
296.012	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	06/27/14	For clarification, it may be helpful for readers to understand that the term of the Navajo Mine Lease is essentially based on the ability of the lessee, NTEC, to mine coal in commercial or paying quantities. Unlike the Four Corners Power Plant lease, which is a term of years, as long as NTEC can mine coal economically, the Navajo Mine Lease term.  Therefore, there is no fixed term of years applicable to the Mine Lease. Rather, barring a lease amendment, the duration of that lease will be dictated by whether mining activity continues and also by the completion of final reclamation activities.	The following sentence has been added to page 2-1: There is no fixed lease term applicable to the Navajo Mine lease. The duration of the lease is contingent upon the continuation of mining activity and the completion of final reclamation activities.
296.013	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	06/27/14	The No Action Alternative discussion also should note that a decision not to approve continued operations of Navajo Mine, FCPP, and the transmission lines and substation, will result in (a) a significant reduction in long-term, reliable, and uninterrupted baseload generation that thousands of consumers throughout the southwest rely upon; and (b) adverse effects on the reliability of the regional power transmission grid in the western United States. Moreover, there is a growing body of research reflecting that the trend of retirement of coal-fired generation facilities will have significant impacts on electricity prices and electricity reliability.	The following sentence has been added to 4.20.4: The No Action Alternative would also result in (a) a substantial reduction in long-term, reliable, and uninterrupted baseload generation that thousands of consumers throughout the southwest rely upon; and (b) adverse effects on the reliability of the regional power transmission grid in the western United States.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.014	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	06/27/14	<p>Section 4.3 Earth Resources: Paleontological Resources Management Plan: In Section 4.3, the DEIS properly describes the previous paleontological surveys conducted within the Navajo Mine Lease Area; however it does not reference the Paleontological Resources Management Plan (PRMP) discussed in Section 4.11 Environmental Justice. As Section 4.11 describes, the PRMP is designed to protect both known and newly discovered paleontological resources within the Navajo Mine Lease Area and proposed Pinabete Permit Area. Numerous paleontological surveys have been conducted within and adjacent to the Navajo Mine Lease Area. These include the 1916 Max Bauer (U.S.G.S), 1972 Hugh Wagner (Department of Paleontology University of California-Berkley), and 1974 Larry Marshall and William Breed (Museum of Northern Arizona), and 1997 Donald Wolberg (New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology) studies. While the DEIS refers to the 2005 Arnold Clifford report (Ecosphere Environmental Services), it is MMCo's understanding that this report was never finalized, and MMCo questions whether it should be included in the FEIS. In the summer 2013, MMCo discussed a proposal with OSM and with the Navajo Nation Minerals Department to complete an updated paleontological inventory within unmined portions of Area III and Area IV North of the Navajo Mine SMCRA Permit Area and the proposed Pinabete Permit Area. MMCo completed the inventory in the fall of 2013. From the paleontological resource information gathered during the inventory, MMCo in consultation with the Navajo Nation Minerals Department, developed the PRMP to document and protect known and previously unknown paleontological resources within the Navajo Mine Lease Area. The PRMP is a management tool which establishes the inventory methodology, the criteria to be used to determine significance, and mitigation strategies for affected paleontological resources. The PRMP also includes procedures and requirements for reporting and curation. MMCo submitted copies of the PRMP to both the Navajo Nation Minerals Department and OSMRE in February 2014. MMCo recommends that OSM provide a summary of this inventory work and associated evaluations of significance including: the paleontological inventory identified 20 localities as potentially significant. Using the PRMP significant criteria 10 these localities were determined to be significant. Of these 10 localities, only three were located within the area of proposed surface disturbance and thus require further management actions. In consultation with OSM and Navajo Nation Minerals Department, one of these three significant sites was mitigated in the fall of 2013</p>	<p>This summary has been included in the Final EIS. The additional information does not change the results, and actually results in fewer impacts.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.015	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	06/27/14	When viewed against the backdrop of the prior surveys, mitigation and avoidance efforts, and the protections of past, present, and proposed Programmatic Agreements, <b>the DEIS overestimates and provides a conservative assessment of the impacts to cultural resources and traditional cultural properties (TCPs)</b> in Area III, Area IV north, Area IV South, and along the Burnham Road North Realignment. The DEIS states that the Proposed Action (Alternative A) will potentially affect 84 cultural resource sites and 6 TCPs; however, <b>these numbers include the cultural resource sites in Area III, Area IV North, and along the Burnham Road North Realignment which were already mitigated or avoided.</b> Specifically, the DEIS describes that there are 56 cultural resource sites (52 cultural resource sites in Area IV North and 4 sites along the Burnham Road North Realignment) which were determined eligible by Navajo Nation Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (NNTHPO) and OSMRE. MMCo has consulted with OSMRE, BIA, BLM, USACOE, Navajo Nation Historic Preservation Department NNHPD, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) on the eligibility and treatment of cultural resource sites and TCPs in Area III, Area IV North, and along the Burnham Road North Realignment area as part of the 2007 PA and 2011 Amended PA for Navajo Mine. Under these two PAs, MMCo has performed testing and mitigation of cultural resource sites and TCPs impacted by mining activities in Area III, Area IV North, and along the Burnham Road North Realignment as directed by the NNHPD and with the concurrence of the signatory parties.	Suggested edits have been made
296.016	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	06/27/14	The draft Second Amended PA (DEIS Appendix B) extends the 2011 PA's coverage into a portion of Area IV South of the Navajo Mine Lease. Within the proposed Area IV South PA coverage area, there are <b>36 cultural resource sites</b> and one TCP which was not part of the Area of Potential Effect (APE) in either the 2007 or 2011 PAs. The NNTHPO has previously determined that of the 36 Area IV South cultural resource sites, 32 are potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Properties (NRHP). Additionally, MMCo and NTEC are also seeking a determination of eligibility on one TCP which is outside of the proposed Pinabete Permit Area but within the revised APE (a 1-mile buffer of the proposed SMCRA permit area). If the Proposed Action is approved, NTEC and MMCo will comply with the mitigation and avoidance measures contained in the Second Amended PA.	Suggested edits have been made
296.017	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		1. Global - Navajo Mine is used to describe both the Navajo Mine SMCRA area and the Navajo Mine Lease Area. The Navajo Mine SMCRA Area is within the Navajo Mine mining lease area but it also consists of various rights-of-ways and surface use areas. The Navajo Mine SMCRA permit area is defined in the OSMRE permit NM-0003F. Consider defining the following terms in the introduction to the DEIS and then use throughout the DEIS:	Change made.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Navajo Mine refers to the to the past, present, and proposed mining and reclamation operations within Area I, II, III, IV North and IV South</li> <li>• Navajo Mine SMCRA Permit Area refers to the land within the existing OSM SMCRA Permit NM-0003F</li> <li>• Navajo Mine Lease Area, refers to the land within the mine lease approved by the Navajo Nation (Areas I, II, III, IV North, IV South, and V) and associated rights-of-ways (e.g., railroad, Area III Access Road, powerline, etc.)</li> <li>• Pinabete Permit Area refers to land within the proposed OSM SCMRA Permit NM-0042A-P</li> </ul> <p>Additionally, the Navajo Mine SMCRA Permit boundary should be included on all Figures within the DEIS.</p>	
296.018	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	X	<p>2. Global - Text in Section 4.4.3, and elsewhere in the DEIS, suggests that the permit transfer from BNCC to NTEC “may lead to changes in the affected environment.” There will be no on-the-ground impacts arising from the permit transfer, and OSM determined that in earlier NEPA compliance work. See OSMRE’s NEPA compliance document for the permit transfer between BNCC and NTEC.</p>	<p>Changed to read (in each section): “Two completed federal actions have been incorporated into the baseline for this analysis...”</p> <p>Then for each section, we have specifically stated whether either of these actions has any effect on the affected environment.</p>
296.019	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		<p>3. Global - For clarity, provide consistent use of terminology referencing the Proposed Action, the ROI and other NEPA terminology. Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ROI for Study Area</li> <li>• Reclamation vs. conservation</li> <li>• Proposed Action for Project Area or Proposed Project</li> <li>• No Action Alternative vs. no project</li> <li>• “Interim” and “transition period”</li> <li>• Use of NEPA terminology instead of ESA terminology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Use ROI for Action Area</li> <li>o Impacts for effects and affects</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Have checked consistency.
296.020	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		<p>4. Global - Please ensure consistency when identifying various features, i.e. transmission lines, haulroads, precipitation events, drainage features.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chaco River is preferred instead of Chaco Wash,</li> <li>• Cottonwood Arroyo is preferred instead of Cottonwood Wash,</li> <li>• Pinabete Arroyo is preferred instead of Pinabete Wash,</li> <li>• No Name Arroyo is preferred instead of, No Name Wash, unnamed arroyo, or unnamed wash, etc. in regards to the drainage feature in Area IV South of the Navajo Mine Lease Area.</li> </ul>	Names listed in the comment have been double-checked for consistency throughout the document.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						MMCo suggests using the published USGS mapping sources to describe the features.	
296.021	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		5. Global - The DEIS uses both “restore/restoration” and “reclaim/reclamation.” These terms have different meanings and are not interchangeable. Restore means replacing the exact conditions which existed pre-disturbance, and reclaim means to create a beneficial useable post-disturbance land use. SMCRA imposes reclamation obligations, and not restoration obligations.	Document has been reviewed for use of these terms. Restore/restoration has been changed to reclaim/reclamation, where appropriate.
296.022	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		<p>6. Global - The DEIS defines three temporal impact categories; short term (during and/or immediately following construction activities), long term (during mining through 2041 including post-reclamation activities), and permanent (after reclamation -post 2041). MMCo agrees with the temporal categories and offers the following information to clarify the duration of the three phases (see detailed schedule information provided in the Navajo Mine and proposed Pinabete SMCRA Permit Application Packages):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed mining actions do not include a separate construction phase with the exception of the segment of Burnham Road that would be realigned. Mine support facilities (i.e., powerlines, haulroads, sediment ponds, etc.) would be constructed concurrent with mining and reclamation activities and would be managed as part of these activities. The Burnham Road segment would be constructed over an approximate 6-9 month period in approximately 2022.</li> <li>• Under Alternatives A, B, C and D, mining would continue through approximately 2041; reclamation (backfilling, regrading and revegetating) would continue through approximately 2051 (Pinabete SMCRA Permit, Section 51, Table 51.1-1). NTEC would monitor revegetation success for a minimum of 10-years through approximately 2061. Reclaimed lands meeting the SMCRA Permit Reclamation Success Criteria will be eligible for Phase III bond release.</li> <li>• Under Alternative E, no new mining would be conducted in Area I, II, III, and IV North. Areas I, II, and III would be reclaimed (i.e., backfilled, graded, and revegetated) by approximately 2023 and the disturbed portions of Area IV would be reclaimed by approximately 2024. A 10-year monitoring period would follow the reclamation activities. Reclaimed lands meeting the SMCRA Permit Reclamation Success Criteria will be eligible for Phase III bond release.</li> <li>• With the exception of certain earth resources (soils, coal seams), reclaiming the disturbed lands to the approximate original contours and land uses (livestock grazing and wildlife habitat) similar to pre-mine land uses mitigates what would be “permanent” impacts to the environmental resources.</li> </ul>	Clarifications have been added to the descriptions of the 5 alternatives in Chapter 3.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.023	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		7. Global - The DEIS overestimates the number of residences impacted by the proposed Pinabete Permit. In several sections, the DEIS states that 5 residences were identified within 0.5 mile of the Pinabete Permit Area. This statement should be revised to state that only 4 residences were located within 0.5 miles of the proposed Pinabete Permit Area. Of these 4 residences, 3 are located within the proposed Pinabete SMCRA Permit boundary. MMCo has completed the relocation of two residences within Area IV North per the respective agreements. These relocations were conducted as part of the approved Area IV North mining activities. Additionally MMCo has an agreement in place to relocate the third residence in advance of mining operations in Area IV South. The fourth residence is outside of the proposed Pinabete Permit Area and is approximately 0.5 from the proposed Pinabete SMCRA permit boundary and would be approximately 0.9 miles away from proposed mining activities.	Corrected.
296.024	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		8. Global - Please ensure the description of BBNMC 2838 water rights are described consistently between the BA and DEIS.	Comment noted
296.025	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		9. Global - The DEIS text describes various pre- and post-mining land uses of the Navajo Mine Lease Area. As described in the Navajo Mine and proposed Pinabete SMCRA Permit Application Packages the pre-mining land uses of the Navajo Mine Lease Area are livestock grazing. Agricultural, crop production, lands are not present within with the Navajo Mine Lease Area. The Navajo Mine SMCRA Permit (OSM NM-0003F) and the Pinabete SMCRA Permit Application Package specify that lands disturbed by mining and reclamation activities will be reclaimed for a post mining land use of livestock grazing and wildlife habitat. The reclaimed lands are not designed and constructed for residential, industrial or agricultural purposes. Under all alternatives, lands disturbed by mining would be reclaimed to a post-mining land use of livestock grazing and wildlife habitat.	Clarifications made (did a global check on pre-mine, post-mine, post-reclamation). See page 4.11-16 – socio “step 3”
296.026	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		10. Sec 1.4.1, Page 1-11 - To further clarify the text in Section 1.4.1, please add the bold [?] text to this sentence  “OSMRE is the Lead Agency directing EIS preparation for the Project. OSMRE will approve, approve with conditions, or disapprove the Pinabete SMCRA permit application to allow coal mining activities; including development of associated of coal processing facilities.”	Please see Master Response #12, Placement of Conditions on Permit and Lease
296.027	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		11. Sec 2.1.2, Page 2-7 - Table 2-3 lists equipment used for Navajo Mine. Table 3-2 lists equipment use for Pinabete Mine. Please note that the same equipment will be used for both permits areas. MMCo suggests combining the tables into one with a footnote to ensure that the reader understands that there is only one set of equipment for both permits areas.	Have added a footnote to Table 3-2 that indicates that these pieces of equipment are not duplicative of the ones listed in Table 2-3.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.028	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	X	12. Sec 2.1.2.2, Page 2-10 - In MMCo's December 2013 response to OSMRE's technical evaluation comments on the Pinabete Permit application, MMCo revised this to state topdressing will not be salvaged where slopes are greater than 3 horizontal to 1 vertical (3h:1V or >33 percent)".	Change made.
296.029	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	X	13. Sec 2.1.3, Page 2-12 - The second coal supply agreement between NTEC and the Four Corners Power Plant owners, for the period 2016 to 2031, should be referenced in this discussion. This would complete the picture, and will also help clarify that there is no contract for coal sales beyond 2031, notwithstanding the FCPP Lease extension to 2041. See also Section 3.2.4.2, page 3-20.	This additional detail does not change the presentation of consequences
296.030	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	X	14. Sec 2.4.1, Page 2-35 - The last sentence should be revised to read: "Therefore, the permit transfer is not dependent on and is not a connected action to the Proposed Action because it would proceed regardless of the outcomes being evaluated in this EIS."	Change made.
296.031	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	X	15. Sec 2.4.2.1, Page 2-36 - MMCo suggests revising the last sentence to read: "For purposes of analysis, the possibility that NTEC assumes an ownership stake in FCPP was assessed for potential inclusion under the cumulative effects section (Section 4.18)."	The potential for NTEC ownership in FCPP is included in the list of cumulative projects in Section 4.18. No change made.
296.032	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		16. Sec 3.2.1.1, Page 3-10 - Mining will occur until 2039, backfill and regrade work will occur until 2051 (see Pinabete PAP Part 7 Section 51, Table 51.1-1). Support facilities would remain in use throughout the duration of the backfilling and grading operations (2051). Following seeding and irrigation there is a 10-year SMCRA liability period which will end no earlier than 2061.	Have changed "All of these support facilities would remain in use for the duration of the permit period (through 2041)." to "Support facilities would remain in use throughout the duration of the backfilling and grading operations."
296.033	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		17. Sec 3.2.1.1, Page 3-14 - Public roads within the mine permit area are built to standards as determined by the "public road authority" designated by OSM (SMCRA CFR 30 Part 761.14(c)). OSM in past actions for the public Burnham Road has designated the BIA as the road authority. On previous relocations of the Burnham Road, BIA required design standards to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) specifications. A similar topic is discussed on the in Section 4.9.4.1 on page 4.9-18 in regards to the primary road design for mine haulroads. Primary roads are designed to SMCRA performance and MSHA design standards.	Have clarified in 2nd full paragraph of 3-14, and in 3rd full paragraph on 4.9-18.
296.034	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		18. Sec 3.2.2.4, Page 3-23 - The sentence "This alternative is technically feasible." may be better stated as follows: "Technology exists to implement this alternative, but it would require re-routing the Pinabete Arroyo in addition to activities described in the Proposed Action. This alternative's increased impacts to Waters of the U.S. in comparison to the Proposed Action renders it challenging under the CWA Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines."	Change made

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.035	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	X	19. Sec 3.2.4.1, Page 3-27 - In this introductory paragraph, for completeness, please consider adding the following additional sentence: "Under this alternative, all other federal permits and approvals would be granted as provided in the Proposed Action."	Change made.
296.036	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		20. Sec 3.2.6, Page 3.2-33 to -48 - Please ensure that applicant proposed measures, best management practices, and standard operating practices are consistent with the final Biological Assessment (BA).	The EIS has been updated to be consistent with the Biological Assessment.
296.037	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	X	21. Sec 3.2.6, Page 3-33 - This sentence needs to include applicant proposed protective measures for Four Corners Power Plant, PNM as well as NTEC and would be applicable to their specific project aspects and requirements. As written it appears that all of the proposed measures would be transferred to NTEC.	Has been clarified (see page 3-34 specifically).
296.038	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		22. Sec 3.2.6.17, page 3-46 - Under "Four Corners Power Plant" heading, MMCo suggests deleting the reference to BNCC 2012a in the last section of the section.	Reference updated.
296.039	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	X	23. Sec 3.3.4.1, Page 3-53 - For clarification MMCo suggests deleting the following sentence as it is not applicable to the Proposed Action: "Mining with these alternative techniques would occur within the existing approved mine plan to mine coal from remaining reserves in Area II and Area III until 2016, under a renewed SMCRA permit NM0003F." NTEC would likely use highwall continuous miners or augers, as stated in Section 3.3.4.1, in all available highwalls within its lease area and operations. MMCo agrees with OSMRE's analysis regarding why these mining alternatives are not carried forward.	No change to EIS. The sentence is not referring to the Proposed Action, but rather an alternative.
296.040	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	X	24. Sec 3.3.5.1, Page 3-55 - On page 3-55 the DEIS states "Coal from San Juan Mine is similar to that at the Navajo Mine, whereas other local mines are unlikely to have similar coal quality and, thus, it could not be burned at the FCPP. San Juan Mine has a production capacity of approximately 8 to 9 million tons annually. At this rate, coal reserves at San Juan Mine are sufficient until 2022 to provide coal to the FCPP to meet the shortfalls estimated for the No Action Alternative; up to 4 million tons would be need to be supplied to make up for the shortfall."  The above paragraph was prepared for a previous action, Navajo Mine Clean Water Act Pre-2016 Individual Permit 404(b)(1) alternatives analysis (USACE IP Permit No. SPA-2011-00122-ABQ, USACE 2011), and is not applicable to Proposed Action. MMCo suggests deleting this paragraph in its entirety.  MMCo agrees with OSMRE's decision to consider San Juan Mine as an off-site coal supply but not carry it forward for consideration (DEIS Section 3.3.5). Under the "Technical Feasibility" and "Economic Feasibility" in DEIS Section 3.3.5.4, the DEIS accurately describes why	Have changed this paragraph to read as follows: Coal from the San Juan Mine is similar to that at the Navajo Mine, and is the best-case example for analysis of this alternative due to its proximity to FCPP. San Juan Mine has a production capacity of approximately 8 to 9 million tons annually.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						it is not feasible to supply coal from San Juan Mine to FCPP for operations through 2041. This discussion is further supported by the USACOE Preliminary Draft Permit Individual Permit Evaluation (DEIS Appendix C, Section 4.2.5.1.1). In the USACOE preliminary permit evaluation, the USACE recognizes that while it is technically feasible to mine coal at San Juan Mine, the availability of the resource, the cost, and logistics eliminate the off-site coal supply as an alternative.	
296.041	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		25. Sec 3.4, Page 3-56 - Suggest in second sentence inserting “direct and indirect” between permanent and impacts to clarify that this table summarizes the direct and indirect impacts analysis, rather than the cumulative effects analysis.	Change made in second paragraph from bottom.
296.042	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		26. Sec 3.4, Page 3-56 to -76 - Table 3-12 appears to present only “negative” impacts of the alternatives. Positive impacts of the action alternatives particularly socioeconomic considerations should be mentioned as well. Similarly, recreation opportunities on Morgan Lake would continue under the action alternatives, but may not under the No Action Alternative.	Impacts are discussed compared with the baseline, not the No Action alternative. There are no positive impacts to socioeconomics or recreation as a result of the proposed action as compared to baseline. No change made.
296.043	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		27. Sec 4, Page 4-1 - The quoted paragraph is attributed to the CEQ; this attribution should be confirmed. The language appears to be from EPA guidance rather than CEQ.	Reference has been updated to EPA 1999.
296.044	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		28. Sec 4.1.1.7 and 4.1.2.3, Pages 4.1-16 and 4.1-26 - The DEIS provides a detailed regulatory framework for Section 4.1 Air Quality. To further clarify the reader’s understanding please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a definition of non-road engine, stationary and mobile sources;</li> <li>• an explanation of the regulatory differences between vehicle (tailpipe) emissions and non-vehicle engines; and</li> <li>• a statement which clarifies that intermittent and fugitive emissions can be from stationary sources, e.g., coal handling conveyors, stockpiles, and dirt roads.</li> </ul>	The comment suggests clarification of mobile versus stationary sources under the regulatory framework sections of Section 4.1, Air Quality. While the suggested clarifications are true, OSMRE does not consider that additional clarification is necessary for the reader to understand the regulatory framework of the EIS analysis. No comments were received indicating that the public was confused about what mobile or stationary sources were or were not included in the air quality analysis. No changes were made to the EIS based on the comment.
296.045	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		29. Sec 4.1.2.3, Page 4.1-27 - As a global comment to Sections 4.1 and 4.2, please clarify that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Navajo Coal preparation plant is a listed source category pursuant to CAA § 302(j).</li> <li>• The SMCRA permit area is not and would not be a major source of stationary emissions as currently defined under the Title V and PSD regulatory programs.</li> <li>• The only mobile sources on the Navajo Mine Lease Area are tailpipe emissions.</li> <li>• Navajo Mine draglines are electric-powered (not diesel powered).</li> </ul>	While true statements, OSMRE does not consider it necessary to include the provided statements in the Final EIS. The statements are informational in nature, are already included in the Draft EIS analysis, and do not add significant additional clarity to warrant revision to the EIS.  No changes were made to the EIS based on the comment, with one exception: Section 2.1.2.4 specifies that draglines are electric powered.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Navajo Mine has two diesel-powered locomotives that can be used in the rare event that the electric train is not operational.</li> <li>• Navajo Mine uses ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel for blasting and mobile equipment that is used on the mine site only.</li> </ul>	
296.046	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		<p>30. Sec 4.2, Page 4.2-2 - Section 4.2 summarizes the global, national, and regional climate change effects that scientists currently believe are related to global GHG emissions. This section also summarizes GHG emissions from the Navajo Mine and FCPP, and puts those emissions in the context of regional, state-wide, and national GHG emissions. This section appropriately evaluates the Navajo Mine and FCPP GHG emissions and impacts on climate change in a regional context. However, it is important to recognize that the Navajo Mine and FCPP GHG emissions and impacts on climate change are even less significant when considered in a global context and it is recognized that climate change is a global phenomenon. This comparison is consistent with CEQ guidance and supports the DEIS conclusion that GHG emissions from the Proposed Action are negligible in the context of global emissions. Similarly, the DEIS should acknowledge that current science cannot link particular GHG emissions to particular climate change impacts. (See <a href="http://energy.gov/sites/prod/files/CEQ_Draft_Guidance-ClimateChangeandGHGemissions-2.18.10.pdf">http://energy.gov/sites/prod/files/CEQ_Draft_Guidance-ClimateChangeandGHGemissions-2.18.10.pdf</a>. CEQ Guidance)</p>	<p>The Draft EIS provides a robust discussion of potential impacts of climate change (see page 4.2-1). The impacts analysis quantifies the CO2e emissions of the FCPP and Navajo Mine in the context of regional, national, and global emissions. With regards to climate change impacts, as stated on page 4.2-23, “while the Proposed action would contribute to the effects of climate change, its contribution relative to other sources would be minor in the short- and long-term.” Implementation of the FIP for BART had the additional effect of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 26% (incorporated as part of the baseline). When compared to other sources of GHG in the region, the reduced contribution from FCPP is considered minor.</p> <p>Climate Change is inherently a cumulative issue; therefore, the Cumulative Effects Section of the EIS (4.18.3.2) also addresses this comment. The cumulative effects study area for climate change includes northeastern Arizona, southwestern Colorado, Navajo Nation, and northwestern New Mexico. The major producers of GHG emissions within this study area are the 17 power plants, as such, the amount of power produced directly relates to the amount of GHG emitted. Table 4.18-4 shows the relative contribution of future FCPP emissions to regional GHG emissions.</p> <p>OSMRE does not consider it necessary to acknowledge that no scientific link is established between particular GHG emissions and climate change. The impacts analysis is focused on CO2e equivalent emissions as the prominent measure for comparison of global warming potentials.</p> <p>No changes were made to the EIS based on the comment.</p>
296.047	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		<p>31. Sec 4.2.1.1, Page 4.2-2 - Federal GHG regulations and reporting requirements do not apply to surface coal mining operations. The Navajo Mine is not a ‘major’ source of stationary emissions as defined under the Title V and PSD regulatory programs. Please indicate this in the introductory paragraphs of Section 4.2.</p>	<p>The change was made, as suggested.</p>
296.048	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		<p>32. Sec 4.2.2.3 and 4.2.2.5, Pages 4.2-6 and 4.2-7 - As a global comment to Section 4.2, the most recent GHG data cited and analyzed ranges from 2010 to 2012. To the extent possible, use the most recent data and, where possible, distinguish between emissions from generation at FCPP and mining at Navajo Mine (see Sections 4.2.2.3, 4.2.2.7, and 4.2.2.8).</p>	<p>The EIS climate change analysis was developed in early 2013; therefore, the GHG data from 2013 and 2014 are not included. Because the EIS analysis was based on 12 years of historic air emissions data, the climate change analysis is a reasonable estimation of future operations.</p> <p>Table 4.2-11, Estimated GHG Emissions from Navajo Mine and FCPP Mobile and Fugitive Sources, provides the requested distinction between FCPP and Navajo Mine emissions.</p> <p>No changes were made to the EIS based on the comment.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.049	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		33. Sec 4.2.2.5, Page 4.2-8 - Please explain “Interim Standard” and what is the “Standard” that these sources are compared to as “Percent of Standard” in right-hand column of the table. For complete comparison, include coal-fired generation.	As indicated in footnote 2, the Interim Standard is per California PUC Decision No. 07-01-039, January 25, 2007 (SB 1368). The “Percent of Standard” is calculated relative to this Interim Standard; ergo, the value on the “Interim Standard” row of the table is 100 percent. The text introducing Table 4.2-3, Comparison of Electric Power Generation GHG Rates, was modified to make it clear that the California PUC Decision Interim Standard is the value to which the others are compared.
296.050	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		34. Sec 4.2.2.6, Page 4.2-9 - Please add a sentence that confirms that GHG emissions at the Navajo Mine are small compared to other sources including global emissions in this section, Section 4.2.2.9 and Table 4.2-11.	The change was made, as suggested.
296.051	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		35. Sec 4.2.2.8, Page 4.2-12 to -14 - For each of these tables, clarify what the “Historic Emissions” and “Historic Baseline” data represent (e.g. averages, totals, per year).	Text was added to indicate that the tables represent total values per year.
296.052	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		36. Sec 4.2.29 and 4.2.3.2, Pages 4.2-15, 4.2-16, and 4.2-22 - DEIS Table 4.1-11 summarize fugitive GHG emissions from Navajo Mine, and cites OSMRE 2012a for BNCC’s Area IV North mine plan Revision EA. The fugitive GHG emissions in that EA were based on the prior production rate of approximately 8.5 million tons per year (M tpy) and thus overestimate the GHG emissions that can be expected from the reduced production rate of approximately 6 M tpy. Similarly, Table 4.2-16 overstates GHG emissions for the same reason. It would be helpful to clarify that the impact analysis uses conservative estimates of levels of GHG emissions from mining activities going forward since mining is expected to proceed at lower levels with the closure of FCPP units 1, 2, and 3. The analysis also reflects that fugitive methane is a more potent greenhouse gas (CO <sub>2</sub> e), and groups the data regarding fugitive mine emissions together with mobile (tailpipe) emissions since mine emissions are considered fugitive sources. The DEIS correctly points out that these mobile and fugitive emissions (together comprising only 0.5% of total Project-wide GHG emissions) comprise a negligible portion of the overall US GHG inventory and a minor portion of regional GHG emissions. The DEIS appropriately points out that the Proposed Action would result in substantial reductions in GHG emissions.	The language introducing Section 4.2 tables was changed to provide the requested indication that numbers are conservative, being based on a previous mine plan that will be reduced based on reduced coal demand from FCPP.
296.053	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		37. Sec 4.2.4.1, Page 4.2-22 - Add “annual” to the first sentence and to the title of tables: “. . . estimated annual GHG emissions . . . .”	Change made.
296.054	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	X	38. Sec 4.3.2.4, Page 4.3-12 - The text on page 4.3-12 describing the Museum of Northern Arizona (MNA) paleontological survey conducted in 1974 is correct in saying the work was conducted prior to mining disturbance in Area III, IV North, IV South, and V. However the text could be improved to clarify that neither NTEC nor its predecessors have conducted any mining activity in Area IV South and Area V. The Navajo Mine SMCRA Permit and Pinabete SMCRA Permit application describe	The phrase “prior to excavation of coal mining pits” has been removed from the sentence.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						historic, current, and proposed mining activities in Area I, II, III, IV North, and IV South of the Navajo Mine Lease Area.	
296.055	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	X	39. Sec 4.3.4.1, Page 4.3-17 - The proposed realignment of the Burnham Road (N5082) would be a permanent feature post-reclamation. MMCo has clarified this in its December 2013 response to OSMRE Technical Evaluation of the Pinabete SMRCA Permit Application (Pinabete SMCRA PAP, Part 5, Section 30, page 30-1). Ancillary two track roads the Navajo Nation does not wish to retain would be reclaimed per the reclamation plan contained within the Pinabete SMCRA permit Application (Pinabete SMCRA PAP, Part 5, Sections 30-39).	The text does not indicate that the realignment of Burnham Road would be temporary. It says that NTEC would remove the ancillary roads at the end of the permit term. Has been clarified in the second full paragraph of the page.
296.056	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	X	40. Sec 4.3.4.1, Page 4.3-18 - The DEIS text on page 4.3-18 accurately identifies management practices of primary roads to minimize impact to soil resources. Ancillary roads are used infrequently by small vehicles for access to environmental monitoring and for inspection purposes (See page 3-10 of the DEIS). These roads do not have the same management practices, because of the infrequent use. See Section 23 of the Pinabete Permit Application Package and Chapter 11 of the Navajo Mine SMCRA Permit Application Package.	<u>The text has been changed to read: Approximately 5.2 miles of primary roads would be constructed under the Proposed Action. Topdressing would be salvaged along primary roadways and stockpiled or hauled to regraded areas. Fugitive dust emissions would be controlled by application of water and chemical road stabilizers. To minimize additional surface disturbance, road maintenance would consist of light blading. Ancillary roads will be maintained in a manner to minimize adverse environmental impacts. To minimize additional surface disturbance, the maintenance is limited to occasional light blading particularly after heavy precipitation that may cause damage. The drainage control structures (i.e., culverts, riprap channels, etc.) will be properly maintained. Periodic inspections will be conducted to ensure proper maintenance and safe operating conditions. With the implementation of these measures, impacts to soils (e.g. erosion, productivity and soil loss) during road construction and maintenance would be minimized.</u>
296.057	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		41. Sec 4.5.1.3, Page 4.5-4 - Section 4.5.1.3 states: "The NNEPA has no water quality standard for total dissolved solids (TDS), sulfate, or fluoride." However, Table 4.5-2 Navajo Nation Water Quality Standards for Designated Uses (all in mg/L except pH) includes values for these parameters. The values included in Table 4.5-2 for TDS, sulfate, and fluoride should be credited to livestock watering recommendations provided by Lardy et.al. (Lardy, G., C. Stoltenow, and R. Johnson 2008. AS-94 Livestock and Water. Acquired from the Internet 8-18-11 from www.ag.ndsu.edu/pubs/h2oqual/watanim/as954.pdf). MMCo suggests adding a footnote to Table 4.5-2 to clarify the source of these values.	These lines have been removed from table since the table is intended to show NNEPA water quality standards and not other applicable recommendations.
296.058	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		42. Sec 4.5.2.2, Page 4.5-27 - MMCo's submitted responses to OSMRE Technical Evaluations (TE) on the proposed Pinabete SMCRA Permit. These responses may be downloaded from <a href="http://www.wrcc.osmre.gov/initiatives/navajoMine/pinabetePermit.shtm">http://www.wrcc.osmre.gov/initiatives/navajoMine/pinabetePermit.shtm</a> . These responses clarified and revised a number of points in the baseline hydrology (Section 18 Water Resources) and the probable hydrologic consequences (Section 41 Probable Hydrologic Consequences) in the	The Final EIS has been revised in Section 4.5 for consistency with the responses to OSMRE Technical Evaluations. Figure 4.5-6 has been modified as follows: • Dixon Pit label has been moved into Area III • Gilmore Depression has been added to Area IV North

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p>Pinabete SMCRA Permit. MMCO suggests the following (TE) responses be addressed in the DEIS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On DEIS Figure 4.5-6 and on pages 4.5-26 through 4.5-27, the DEIS identifies three stock impoundments within the Pinabete SMCRA Permit Area. MMCo has revised its SMCRA permit to state there are four stock ponds within the Pinabete Permit Area. Three stockponds (Area 4N pond (Pond 1), Area 4N/4S Pond (Pond 2), and Stevenson Well Pond (Pond 3)) were in-channel ponds and determined jurisdictional. The fourth pond, the Gilmore Depression, was not determined to be jurisdictional and seldom has water present. For clarification, MMCo suggests harmonizing the DEIS text on jurisdictional stockponds and Figure 4.5-6 with its TE responses to Section 18 Water Resources.</li> <li>• MMCo revised the post-reclamation watershed boundaries in the Pinabete SMCRA Permit. These revisions clarified the watershed acreage and estimated sediment yields based on the updated sediment modeling. For clarification, DEIS Table 4.5-12 should be harmonized with MMCo's revised Table 4.1.3-5 as submitted to OSMRE.</li> <li>• On DEIS page 4.5-50a and in relation to recommended changes to DEIS Table 4.5-12, MMCo suggests rewording the first bullet to read, "Sediment contributions from reclaimed areas are projected to increase slightly, or be the same as pre-mine conditions in the South Fork of Cottonwood and at the mouth of Cottonwood. These projections are approximately 5 percent, and are within the anticipated error of the SEDCAD model. Sediment contributions from the Pinabete Arroyo and the unnamed tributary of Chaco River are likely to decrease between pre-mine and post-reclamation conditions."</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The figure pertains to both existing and proposed structures. As such, the sediment ponds have not been removed from the figure.</li> <li>• Unnamed Arroyo has been changed to No Name Arroyo</li> <li>• Pinabete Arroyo typo corrected</li> <li>• The four stock ponds in the Pinabete permit area have been renamed from North to South as Gilmore Depression, Area IV N, Area IV N/S, Stevenson Well Pond.</li> </ul>
296.059	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		<p>43. Sec 4.5, Page 4.5-32 - BBNMC holds all rights under Permit 2838, which is used to supply the FCPP and Navajo Mine with any necessary water supply. NTEC has no rights under the permit. For clarity consider rewording the first paragraph under the heading "Water Use" as follows: "BBNMC holds all rights under New Mexico Office of the State Engineer Permit 2838 which provides a total diversionary right of 51,600 acre-feet annually and a consumptive use right of 39,000 acre-feet annually for surface water from the San Juan River. The water available under Permit 2838 supplies all the water needs of FCPP and Navajo Mine. Water is diverted from the San Juan River into Morgan Lake where it is stored for use at the plant, for all operations (cooling and related purposes), and the mine, for mining, coal processing, and reclamation.."</p>	Changed as suggested.
296.060	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		<p>44. Sec 4.6, 4.7, 4.8 - Several years of wildlife surveys conducted on the mine site, and the Biological Evaluations for Navajo Mine (Ecosphere 2011) and the proposed Pinabete Permit Area (Ecosphere 2014), the extensive Ecological Risk Assessments (AECOM 2013) and (EPRI 2013) and the AECOM Habitat model (AECOM 2013) all provide detailed information to further support the DEIS' wildlife analysis.</p>	Thank you for your comment. These resources would used in the development of the Draft EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.061	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		45. Sec 4.7.2.1 and 4.7.2.2, Page 4.7-6 - Ponds and impoundments at Navajo Mine and proposed for Pinabete have intermittent water availability. See section 4.7.2.1 and 4.7.2.2.	<p>Analysis of impacts to wildlife was based upon these references as well as many others in support of a determination and Project effects on species. References have been provided in each of the Sections 4.6, 4.7, and 4.8 where they were appropriate for species level determinations.</p> <p>In regards to Section 4.6, presently the text states that more detailed vegetation analysis was completed along the FCPP, Mine, and portions of the Transmission lines. Multiple years of mine vegetation analysis is clearly called out in the vegetation sections.</p> <p>In regards to Section 4.7, the use of these references identified in the comment, and others, are identified and referenced in the appropriate sections of Section 4.7. The references and citations in the sections leading to Section 4.7.4 (Environmental Consequences) are indented to lead the reader to identification of anticipated Project impacts on wildlife detailed in Section 4.7.4. To reinforce the use of these studies, an introductory paragraph summarizing these studies has been included at the beginning of Section 4.7.</p> <p>In regards to Section 4.8, the use of these references identified in the comment, and others, are identified and referenced in the appropriate sections of Section 4.8. The references and citations in the sections leading to Section 4.8.4 (Environmental Consequences) are intended to lead the reader to identification of anticipated Project impacts on Special Status species detailed in Section 4.8.4. To reinforce the use of these studies, an introductory paragraph summarizing these studies has been included at the beginning of section 4.8.</p>
296.062	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		46. Sec 4.7.2.2, Page 4.7-6 - Consider providing separate tables of species expected to occur in the ROI for each of the major project components (FCPP, SMCRA permit renewal and proposed Pinabete Permit Area, and transmission lines). Although a brief description is provided that indicates what the most common species are in the Navajo Mine area, the combined tables infer that the Navajo Mine area has more species and habitat than the multiple years of site-specific studies demonstrate.	OSMRE reviewed the tables and evaluated this request. There is not sufficient information available about the distribution of many of the species identified to accurately separate the tables at the level of detail requested. The area specific descriptions (Navajo Mine, FCPP, transmission lines) provide general lists of species present, as indicated in the various resource reports provided by the applicants, the Navajo Nation, agency databases and other materials reviewed. These sources are not exhaustive, however, and tend to focus on special-status, game or high profile species, while the tables provide a more exhaustive list of species potentially present. We also considered that this action will extend over 25 years and that species distributions may change over this time. Thus, while a species may not be present in a specific area currently, that species may occur in that area at some point in the future, particularly if it is a mobile species or can be found in the vicinity of the specific area in question.
296.063	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		47. Sec 4.7.4.1, Page 4.7-32 - For clarification MMCo conducts annual wildlife surveys to monitor raptors on and within a 1-mile buffer of the SMCRA permit area.	The following sentence added as requested: These impacts would be minimized by the required performance of annual wildlife surveys within the mine area (and within one-mile of the SMCRA permit area for raptors), which will identify species in areas, or in the vicinity of areas to be disturbed and by removal of vegetation during the non-breeding

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							season for most species, as practical, to eliminate habitat prior to beginning ground disturbing activities.
296.064	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		48. Sec 4.7, 4.8 - Please ensure consistency between DEIS Sections 4.6, 4.7, 4.8 with the final Biological Assessment (BA) as applicable for federally-listed species, the Biological Evaluation (BE) for the Pinabete Permit Area (Ecosphere, 2014), the Navajo Mine Biological Evaluation (Ecosphere 2011), and the Biological Clearance Form for the Pinabete Permit Area (Navajo Fish and Wildlife, 2014), including the consistency between the mitigation measures.	Sections 4.6, 4.7, 4.8 and 4.18.3 have been updated for consistency with various other project related documents including the Biological Assessment.
296.065	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		49. Sec 4.8, Page 4.8-1 - Please rewrite this paragraph as follows for greater clarity: "Federal agencies are required by section 7 of the ESA to ensure that any actions authorized, funded or carried out by the agency do not jeopardize the continued existence of a federally listed threatened or endangered species, or result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitat. For actions involving major ground-disturbing activities with the potential to affect listed species or designated critical habitat, the lead federal agency (OSMRE) must prepare a Biological Assessment (BA) to determine the effect of the action on listed species and designated habitat. In the event the agency, through the BA, determines that a listed species will be adversely affected or critical habitat adversely modified, the agency must formally consult with the USFWS. As a result of the formal consultation, the USFWS will issue a Biological Opinion (BO) for purposes of determining whether the action would jeopardize the continued existence of any listed species or result in the adverse modification of critical habitat; and for any appropriate measures or alternatives to avoid jeopardy or adverse modification. In compliance with section 7 of the ESA, OSMRE will submit a BA to the USFWS and engage in formal section 7 consultation for the purpose of addressing any adverse effects of the Project on listed species or their critical habitat. Formal consultation will conclude and a final biological opinion issue in advance of a Record of Decision for purposes of NEPA."	Because this does not change any of the analysis, change not made.
296.066	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		50. Sec 4.8, page 4.8-2 - On Page 4.8-2, MMCo suggests rewording the third sentence in the second paragraph on the page by adding at the beginning, "If the USFWS determines that jeopardy or adverse modification will result from the project, the BO will include ..."	Change made
296.067	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		51. Sec 4.8.2, Page 4.8-6 - To complement Table 4.8-1, consider including maps [where available] showing locations of direct observations of special status species, designated critical habitat, and suitable habitat. Appendix D of Habitat Model (AECOM 2013) has habitat maps for several USFWS species.	This would not benefit the overall analysis.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.068	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		52. - Mountain plover are listed on the Navajo Endangered Species List and BLM Special Status list. Mountain plover have the potential to occur on the Navajo Mine lease and have been documented (including breeding) outside but in close proximity to the 1-mile buffer. Please consider evaluating the impacts, if any, on the mountain plover.	We have reviewed the potential presence of mountain plover within the ROI and considered the potential impact to this species, as appropriate.
296.069	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		53. Sec 4.9.4.1, Page 4.9-19 - The DEIS text on page 4.9-19 describes a temporary traffic management plan required by the BIA to be implemented during the reconstruction of the Burnham Road prior to the permanent reroute of the Burnham Road, which was completed in 2012. Because the permanent reroute has been completed, the traffic management plan as discussed in the DEIS text is no longer applicable.	There is no discussion of a temporary traffic management plan in this section. It is not our understanding that the permanent reroute has been completed given that it is part of the proposed action.
296.070	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		54. Sec 4.10.3.2, Page 4.10-26 - The DEIS on page 4.1-2 underestimates the beneficial impact of the transfer of ownership of the mine to the Navajo Nation. The ASU study, "Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine, an Economic Impact Analysis" (ASU 2013) on page 40 states, "If FCPP Units 1-3 are shut down, coupled with an associated reduction in coal production and the change in ownership at Navajo Coal Mine, this could result in a combined estimated gain of 169 jobs, \$7.5 million labor income, and \$9.7 million gross state product from tribal taxes, royalties and tax exemptions alone for the following year in the Navajo Nation, compared to the situation in 2011 when all five units operated at FCPP and Navajo Mine was owned by BHP Navajo Coal Company."	The Draft EIS acknowledges the potential economic benefits to the Navajo Nation from NTEC's acquisition of the Navajo Mine in Section 4.10.3.2, as follows: "Now that NTEC owns the Navajo Mine, the baseline fiscal contribution of the Navajo Mine to NTEC is expected to be higher than the estimated \$28.1 million with existing ownership. Because NTEC would be exempt from some local, state, and federal taxes, net revenues after taxes would be higher, so conceivably more revenue would be available to the tribal government." The Draft EIS did not include the exact referenced language from the ASU economic impact study because it runs somewhat counter-intuitive to the reader to state that there will be an economic gain from the shutdown of Units 1-3. Rather the Draft EIS, accounts for this benefit in the sentence above, as well as discusses the potential offset from shutting down Units 1-3 and NTEC acquiring the Navajo Mine in Section 4.10.3.4 where the following language is included: "[t]his loss may be offset by the profits and deferred taxes accrued by NTEC's ownership of Navajo Mine, but the difference is not expected to fully offset the payments traditionally realized by the Navajo Nation from BNCC."
296.071	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		55. Sec 4.11 - The third step of the analysis in the Environmental Justice section for each resource evaluated correctly concludes that there will be no disproportionate major adverse effects. The text of the Environmental Justice section supports these conclusions by incorporating the information included in the resource sections in the DEIS, see page 4.11-12, and by summarizing for each resource the potential impacts associated with the Proposed Action, and its alternatives, as well as the changes in the baseline conditions resulting from the closure of Units 1, 2, and 3, the applicant proposed measures, best management practices, and mitigation measures.	Comment noted.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.072	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		<p>56. Sec 4.11.3.1, Page 4.11-17 to 4.11-19 - The DEIS supports the conclusion for water resources and land and transportation resources and can benefit from the following information: During mining, NTEC would provide alternative sources for livestock watering (e.g., water tanks) to customary land users holding grazing permits, who request assistance, for affected areas within the NTEC lease. After mining operations are completed, NTEC would replace the four livestock impoundments affected by mining with post-reclamation livestock permanent impoundments. Post-reclamation impoundments would be constructed near original pre-mining locations. The replacement livestock impoundments or wells would provide comparable water quantity and quality for use in livestock watering to pre-mine impoundments. (See Section 35, Technical Evaluation Permit Revisions, Pinabete Permit Application Package).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Permittees are compensated for their grazing in accordance with Navajo law and the terms of the Navajo Mine Lease. BNCC negotiated and executed agreements over time with grazing permit, and CUA holders to compensate for the value of disrupted livestock production and relocation or replacement of improvements to their grazing area due to mining activities.</li> <li>• The post-mine land use is designated as livestock grazing and wildlife habitat.</li> <li>• In addition, NTEC and MMCo comply with the SMCRA permit, NPDES permit, 404 permit, and 401 certifications regulations and OSMRE conducts a comprehensive analysis of cumulative hydrologic impacts as part of the SMCRA permitting process.</li> </ul> <p>For more in depth information on customary land use, and providing water resources during mining, see:</p> <p>Pinabete SMCRA permit applicable package: Part I, Section 6.0; Part 2, Section 10.2, Pre-Mining Land Use, the Navajo Mine; and Part 3, Section 20, Exhibit 20.8-1 Blasting Area Location Map and the Navajo Mine Permit F: Chapter 1, Section 1.1.4.4, Customary Use Area Interest (Leased Area); Chapter 1, Section 1.1.5.4, Customary Use Area Interest (Lands Contiguous to the Leased Area); and Technical Evaluation Permit Revisions, Pinabete Permit Application Package: Section 35, Hydrologic Reclamation Plan and Chapter 2, Section 2.1, Pre-mining and Existing Land Use.</p>	This would not change the overall analysis.
296.073	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		<p>57. Sec 4.12.2.3, Page 4.12-2 - Please state that the Partial Final Decree has been appealed to the New Mexico Court of Appeals. The appeal is in its initial phases at this time.</p>	The following sentence has been added: The Partial Final Decree has since been appealed to the New Mexico Court of Appeals and no decision has yet been rendered.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.074	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		58. Sec 4.12.2.6, Page 4.12-3 - The DEIS Section 4.12.2.6 states that human remains are considered “cultural items” and not treated as an ITA. Section 4.12.2.4 states that human remains can be considered an ITA if they are associated with land status, a treaty, or other statute. These two sections should be harmonized.	Both statements are correct. Both BIA and NAGRPA consider human remains “cultural items”, but if human remains are part of a treaty/land designation/or congressional act, then those items/remains would qualify as ITAs per some land stipulation. No change to text made.
296.075	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		59. Sec 4.12.4.1, Page 4.12-4 - The DEIS overstates the amount of coal to be produced for all Alternatives. Historically with all 5 units (units 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5) operating at Four Corner Power Plant (FCPP), Navajo Mine produced approximately 8-9 million (M) tons per year (tpy). With the shutdown of Units 1, 2, and 3 in December 2013, Navajo Mine will produce approximately 6 M tpy to meet the needs of FCPP. Table 3-5 in the DEIS correctly estimates the amount of coal needed for the Proposed Action. The cost analysis of coal produced, and Table 4.12-1, should be re-evaluated based on an annual production of approximately 6 M tons and 134 M tons for the 25-year lease term.	<p>Thank you for your comment. Table 4.12-1 has been revised to correspond accurately with Table 3-5 and the corresponding text has been revised as follows: In 2011, the average price of coal produced in New Mexico was \$34.22 per ton (US Energy Information Administration 2012). This amount is the price of coal produced and delivered to market, the value of coal in the ground is much lower because of the substantial costs associated with extraction. Assuming a similar BTU rating for average New Mexico coal and the Navajo Mine coal, this analysis estimates a market value of \$34.22 per ton for coal from the Navajo Mine. Table 4.12 shows that coal valued at approximately \$4.6 billion (based on the 2011 New Mexico price) would be extracted during the permit period; however, the future price of coal produced at the Navajo Mine may change as a result of the transfer of ownership of the mine to the NTEC.</p> <p>A small percentage of the coal resources (between 8 and 10 percent) would be unrecoverable ‘wedges’ and ‘ribs’ at the top and bottom of the coal seams. This unrecoverable coal is not included in Table 4.12 1, so an additional 10.7 million (8 percent of 134 million) to 13.4 million (10 percent of 134 million) valued at \$458 million (assuming \$34.22 per ton) would be lost as wedges and ribs.</p>
296.076	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		60. Sec 4.12.4.1, Page 4.12-5 - Section 2.1.2.6 estimates approximately 8 percent of the total coal reserve is lost as wedges and ribs. Section 4.12.4.1 cites a range of 8-10% for coal lost to ribs and wedges. MMCo suggests using the value cited in Section 2.1.2.6 (8%) in Section 4.12.4.1 to calculate the amount of coal reserves lost to coal ribs and wedges.	Section 4.12.4.1 has been amended to not include the additional 2 percent in referring to coal lost to ribs and wedges, as follows: A small percentage of the coal resources (approximately 8 percent) would be unrecoverable ‘wedges’ and ‘ribs’ at the top and bottom of coal seams.
296.077	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		61. Sec 4.12.4.1, Page 4.12-6 to 4.12-7 - The NPDES permit for Navajo Mine authorizes discharges. In the history of the Navajo Mine NPDES permit, there have been 11 discharges (1977 to present). NTEC also maintains a NNEPA issued Section 401 water quality certification in conjunction with its NPDES permit. An authorized outfall discharge does not automatically constitute a “surface impoundment violation.” MMCo is unaware of any “violations” and therefore is unclear which “violations” are referenced in the sentence... “It is worth noting that there have been past surface impoundment violations and there are currently a limited number of impoundments meeting NNEPA surface water quality standards.” Please clarify.	Sentence has been deleted.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.078	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	X	62. Sec 4.14.4 - Section 4.14.4 (Noise and Vibration) states that “simple spreadsheet calculations” were used in developing the noise impact analysis. MMCo submits that such calculations may be too simplistic to accurately evaluate noise impacts to various receptors in multiple locations arising from a complex combination of stationary and mobile sources operating over wide areas at various heights, in varying terrain, yielding noise emissions both sequentially and simultaneously. Using the “simple spreadsheet calculations” results in an overly conservative impact analysis and overestimates noise impacts. This Section states that OSM did not use a computer generated model such as CadnaA or SoundPlan because “detailed information was not available.” While widely disseminated in the two SMCRA permit application materials, each containing approximately 7,000 pages of detailed information, MMCo believes that the information needed to develop a computer aided noise model is available in the record, but might be difficult to glean from the vast information provided. MMCo will gather the input information from the baseline resources data and provide OSMRE with a computer generated noise model to assist OSMRE in refining the current “simple spreadsheet” model.	MMCo submitted a noise report to OSMRE on September 10. The report has been reviewed and text has been revised to incorporate the findings. Results provided in the noise report do not change any of the conclusions provided in the Draft EIS.
296.079	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		63. Sec 4.16 - The DEIS establishes two ROI’s: a primary ROI to analyze impact for recreation resources, which includes the Proposed Action footprint, and a regional ROI to analyze regional recreational resources in the Four Corners area. The regional ROI includes a 15 – 20 mile radius around to FCPP and Navajo Mine and a five-mile area around the transmission lines. The DEIS takes a conservative approach by analyzing impacts recreation resources by including resources outside of the 20-mile ROI.	Comment noted.
296.080	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		64. Sec 4.16, Page 4.16-1 - The DEIS does a good job identifying regional recreation resources within the Four Corners area. To further support the analyses consider listing the state, county and tribal recreation areas and local activities (i.e., Northern Navajo Shiprock Fair), and referencing land use plans, which discuss recreation areas.	This would not benefit the analysis.
296.081	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		65. Sec 4.17, Page 4.17-1 - The AECOM (2013) HHRA evaluated risk inhalation of contaminations from stack emissions as well as from consumption of food and water within the deposition area. Consider referencing the report and the scope of the HHRA in the opening paragraphs of Section 4.17.	The following sentences were added to the opening paragraph of Section 4.17: A screening level risk assessment evaluating potential risk to sensitive receptors from diesel exhaust and a human health risk assessment were conducted for the Project. The human health risk assessment evaluated risk inhalation of contaminations from stack emissions as well as from consumption of food and water within the deposition area.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.082	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		66. Sec 4.17.1, Page 4.17-1 - The DEIS appropriately recognizing MSHA and SMCRA regulation concerning worker and public health and safety. SMCRA also includes other health and safety regulations protective of public health such as 30 CFR 780.13 (blasting plans), 30 CFR 816.61-816.67 (blasting operations) and 30CFR 761.11 (safety around public facilities and structures).	Comment noted.
296.083	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	X	67. Sec 4.17.2.1, Page 4.17-4 - In addition to the other health studies cited in the DEIS (Section 4.17.4.1), OSM conducted two human health risk analyses that evaluate coal dust and diesel particulate matter impacts. These risk analyses show that that metals present in Navajo coal would not pose and unacceptable risk to human health and that particulate emission from mining operations would not pose a major health risk from sensitive receptors. The DEIS acknowledges two regional studies: the San Juan County Community Health Profile (Community Health improvement Council for San Juan County, May , 2009) and the Navajo Coal Combustion and Respiratory Health Near Shiprock, New Mexico (Bunnell, et.al. 2010). The SJC health study results included in Community Health Profile are considered by EPA in setting NAAQS. As discussed in DESI Section 4.1 it states the proposed action will be in compliance with NAAQS.  The Bunnell et.al. coal burning in home study identifies an exposure to air pollutants unique to Shiprock communities using coal for domestic heating. Note that this study is not used by EPA or other regulators to determine ambient air quality standards or risks associated with ambient air exposures. To the extent relevant, the Bunnell study supports the conclusions in the DEIS because it states that the respiratory disease burden in the Shiprock area may be reduced by changing indoor home heating behavior and improving stove quality.	Comment noted.
296.084	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		68. Sec 4.17.4.1, Page 4.17-21 - MMCo agrees with OSMRE's conclusion that the "effects of [diesel] particulate emissions during mining would not pose a major health risk to sensitive receptors (e.g., residents) located downwind of the mine." MMCo also agrees with OSMRE that the screening level health assessment utilized a conservative exposure methodology (maximum mining activity levels and timeframes) and thus overstates potential impacts. Importantly, however, the discussion at pp. 4.17-20 – 4.17-21 overstates the potential health risks even more than OSMRE has concluded.  OSMRE identified a potential elevated cancer risk from diesel particulate matter (DPM) of between 1 and 2 in a million based on the conservative exposure methodology noted above, and using the cancer unit risk factor developed by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA). That cancer unit risk factor was developed using the same methodology used by the U.S. EPA to calculate its draft unit risk factor for DPM. EPA's draft unit risk factor was expressly rejected by the Clean Air Science Advisory Committee (CASAC), the	Text has been modified to more clearly state the degree of conservatism in the use of the model.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p>independent peer review panel for EPA’s health assessments related to air pollutants. See EPA CASAC, Review of Diesel Health Assessment Document, pp.-2 1 (October 7, 1998) (available at <a href="http://yosemite.epa.gov/sab/sabproduct.nsf/D17EBED8B8A7871A8525718F004F8FC0/\$File/casa9901.pdf">http://yosemite.epa.gov/sab/sabproduct.nsf/D17EBED8B8A7871A8525718F004F8FC0/\$File/casa9901.pdf</a>). CASAC found that “Neither of the two approaches employed by the Agency to use animal data to generate estimates of human risks associated with environmental exposure to diesel exhaust was found to be supported by present knowledge.” Id. at 4. The same concern applies to the OEHHA unit risk factor. Ultimately, EPA declined to adopt a unit risk factor for diesel exhaust, a conclusion with which CASAC concurred. See EPA CASAC, Review of EPA’s Health Assessment Document for Diesel Emissions, p. 1 (February 4, 2000) (available at <a href="http://yosemite.epa.gov/sab/sabproduct.nsf/C248BA0DCA94AD6B8525719B005DF0D5/\$File/casa0004.pdf">http://yosemite.epa.gov/sab/sabproduct.nsf/C248BA0DCA94AD6B8525719B005DF0D5/\$File/casa0004.pdf</a>).</p> <p>Accordingly, MMCo suggests using the chronic Reference Concentration developed by EPA, approved by CASAC and published in EPA’s IRIS database (5 ug/m3) instead of the OEHHA unit risk factor to calculate potential cancer risks from DPM, to evaluate non-cancer adverse effects. See EPA, IRIS Database, Diesel engine exhaust (available at <a href="http://www.epa.gov/iris/subst/0642.htm">http://www.epa.gov/iris/subst/0642.htm</a>). OSMRE should note that the approach to developing the OEHHA unit risk factor was determined to be flawed, and thus that potential risks are likely lower than the DEIS estimates. Finally, MMCo would like to note that DPM is not “considered a hazardous air pollutant” by EPA. (p. 4.17-20.) Rather, DPM has been added to an informal, non-regulatory list of compounds considered to be “mobile source air toxics,” or MSATs. See EPA, Mobile Source Air Toxics (available at <a href="http://www.epa.gov/otaq/toxics.htm">http://www.epa.gov/otaq/toxics.htm</a>).</p>	
296.085	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		<p>69. Sec 4.17.4.5, Page 4.17-26 - On page 4.17-6, the DEIS states, “Impacts to Public Health may increase prior to the anticipated mine closure from an increase in mining activity due to the anticipated mine closure.” MMCo clarifies that mining will not increase or become less safe if the No Action Alternative is selected. NTEC and MMCo will continue to comply with all applicable regulatory requirements and permit conditions.</p>	Change made.
296.086	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		<p>70. Sec 4.18, Page 4.18-1 - The DEIS’ cumulative effects section builds on and is supported by the entire DEIS, including the discussion of the environmental baseline, which includes the past impacts from Navajo Mine, FCPP, and impacts from other past development, and the discussion in the direct and indirect impacts sections, which describe the short and long term impacts associated with the Project, if approved. Many of our comments suggest cross-referencing the other sections, of the DEIS, which provide support for the conclusions reached in the cumulative effects section. The comments we provide in this section are for clarification and, in our opinion, further support the conclusions reached in this section.</p>	Thank you for your comment. Additional references to sections that describe project-related effects have been included (see responses to comments 296.088). OSMRE has reviewed the list of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects with the Cooperating Agencies and confirmed their status. OSMRE feels that it is clear to the reader which projects are carried forward for cumulative analysis and which ones are not. Justification for this screening-process is included for each project.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p>Table 4.18-1 identifies past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects based on scoping comments and input from cooperating agencies. That table identifies those projects carried forward for analysis and those projects which are not, based on whether the project meets the temporal or geographic criteria. The text preceding Table 4.18-1, in conformance with NEPA guidance, describes the temporal criteria as including actions that have occurred in the past or that are or will occur during the timeframe of the analysis, i.e., through 2041 and the time necessary for reclamation of the Pinabete Permit Area, which is through 2061. As OSMRE correctly explains, again consistent with the NEPA guidance OSMRE cites, the geographic scope varies by resource and OSMRE developed a cumulative effect study area for each resource.</p> <p>The DEIS, both in the cumulative effects section and in the separate resource chapters, contains detailed information about the impacts, when relevant, of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects. With respect to impacts from past actions, the DEIS' cumulative effects analysis follows CEQ guidance, including CEQ's 2005 guidance, cited on page 4-18-4, by providing "an analysis and concise description of identifiable present effects of past actions to the extent that they are relevant and useful." CEQ 2005. CEQ guidance confirms that NEPA does not require an agency to "delv[e] into the historical details of individual past actions" but instead that an agency can focus on the "current aggregate effects of past actions." Id.</p> <p>MMCo requests that OSMRE review the projects identified in the table and confirm that all relevant projects are included and their impacts discussed in the cumulative effects resource sections as relevant in the final EIS. For example, both the Navajo Mine and FCPP could be added to Table 4-18-1 because, although the DEIS throughout acknowledges that the past impacts from Navajo Mine and FCPP are part of the baseline, it may be helpful to the reader to include them in the table as well. Similarly, the table appropriately identifies past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future oil and gas development. As you move from draft to final, please clarify for the reader that the cumulative effects analysis includes impacts, as relevant from oil and gas development in the region. MMCo also notes that, during the pendency of the DEIS, the status of some of the projects identified in Table 4.18-1 may have changed and the final EIS may need to be updated to reflect their current status.</p> <p>Finally, MMCo suggests breaking down the "Rationale for Consideration or Elimination" column into its relevant component parts to demonstrate why the project was either carried forward or eliminated from review. For example, SJGS is appropriately carried forward because it is a past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future project and it has had or is expected to have effects on resources common to the Proposed Action, found within the resource defined ROI, such as air, climate change, visibility. Similarly, the proposed Ute Mountain Ute Power Generation Facility was properly eliminated because, although, if constructed, it may</p>	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						have effects in the same ROI as the Proposed Action, it is not a reasonably foreseeable future action because it is too speculative at this time.	
296.087	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		71. Sec 4.18.3.1, Page 4.18-35 - Although the DEIS includes the past impacts from Navajo Mine in the baseline, consider adding a discussion here of past/present/future Navajo Mine impacts on air quality, or cross-referencing the other sections of the DEIS that already provide the background information and support for the cumulative effects analysis. For example, Section 4.1 discusses air quality in great detail, including the various studies undertaken to model and quantify past and future impacts from the Navajo Mine and FCPP, as well as studies regarding past impacts from other operations in the San Juan Basin. Table 4.1-1 in Section 4.1 is helpful because it identifies the National Ambient Air Quality Standards. Considering referring back to that table or reproducing it in this discussion. Section 4.1.2.5 includes a discussion of the regional air quality planning tool that can be used to evaluate impacts of future development projects. Consider referring back to this section when discussing future impacts from the Proposed Action and other future projects, because it provides helpful information regarding future impacts.	The following reference has been added to Section 4.18.3.1 to guide the reader back to the potential direct effects to climate change: "Please see Section 4.2.2, Section 4.2.3, and Tables 4.2.2 – 4.2.10 for information on FCPP GHG emissions when compared to the other GHG generation sources in the region. This information was directly taken into account for assessing cumulative climate change effects".
296.088	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		72. Sec 4.18.3.2, Page 4.18-36 - As with other resources, the DEIS includes background information and analysis that informs the cumulative effects analysis for climate change. Consider cross-referencing those sections here. For example, Table 4.1-7 quantifies the emissions from mobile sources at Navajo Mine. Consider expanding the analysis of Navajo Mine's and FCPP's contributions to regional and global GHG emissions using the information already developed in Section 4.2.2.6, which provides context for the discussion of cumulative effects from the Mine and FCPP on climate change. Table 4.2-11 provides useful information regarding estimated GHG emissions from Navajo Mine and FCPP, as do Tables 4.2-16 to 17. Consider cross-referencing. Tables 4.2-4 to -10 provide helpful information regarding past FCPP and other power plant contributions of GHG emissions. Table 4.2-6 provides useful information on past GHG emissions statewide. This table also appears to provide useful information from which to estimate present and future GHG emissions statewide. Consider cross-referencing that table.	The following reference has been added to Section 4.18.3.2 to guide the reader back to the potential direct effects to climate change: "Please see Section 4.2.2, Section 4.2.3, and Tables 4.2-2 – 4.2-10 for information on FCPP GHG emissions when compared to the other GHG generation sources in the region. This information was directly taken into account for assessing cumulative climate change effects".
296.089	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		73. Sec 4.18.3.4, Page 4.18-40 to -41 - Consider cross-referencing or summarizing the relevant portions of the previous DEIS chapters, which provide useful background information and analysis. For example, the Cultural Resources section of the DEIS, Chapter 4.4, provides context for the cumulative effects analysis, including describing the studies that have been undertaken and the resources that have been identified. See, e.g., Section 4.4.2.2. Tables 4.4-2 to -6, and the supporting text, provide useful information about the potentially affected historic properties within the Project area by alternative. These tables provide useful context for the cumulative effects analysis.	The following reference has been added to Section 4.18.3.4 to guide the reader back to the potential direct effects to cultural resources: Please also see Section 4.4.3, Section 4.4.4, and Tables 4.4-2 – 4.4-6 for information on historic and potential future effects to cultural resources as result of FCPP and Navajo Mine operations. As stated in Section 4.4.4, OSMRE is consulting with the Navajo Nation THPO on determinations of eligibility for 20 resources and Project effects for historical properties within the APE. These potential Project effects served as the basis for assessing cumulative effects in the Four Corners region and on tribal trust lands.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.090	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		74. Sec 4.18.3.5, Page 4.18-41 - The introduction to this section correctly states that the impacts from past projects are accounted for as part of the affected environment, but could be clarified for user-friendliness to better explain how those projects are accounted for in the affected environment. For example, the discussion in Section 4.5.2.1 (Affected Environment Pre-2014) provides useful information regarding past groundwater studies, monitoring, and background information on groundwater properties. Consider cross-referencing that section and its included tables and citations. Section 4.5.2.1 also provides helpful background information on groundwater quality. Consider cross-referencing that discussion as well.	The following reference has been added to Section 4.18.3.5 to guide the reader back to the potential direct effects to water resources: "Please see section 4.5.4 for a discussion of potential project-related effects that were taken into account for assessing cumulative effects".
296.091	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		75. Sec 4.18.3.5, Page 4.18-41 - The DEIS correctly states on page 4.5-6, "Groundwater availability in the Fruitland Formation is limited by its relatively low hydraulic conductivity (0.002 to 0.00013 feet per day), which means that water cannot move easily through pores or fractures in the formation, as well as low rates of recharge." The Navajo Mine SMCRA Permit Package (NM-0003F, Chapter 6), Pinabete SMCRA Permit Application Package (Part 2, Section 18), and OSMRE's Cumulative Hydrologic Impact Assessment (CHIA) (OSMRE 2012) support the DEIS analysis that the groundwater production in the Fruitland Formation is expected to be limited.	Thank you for your comment and review of the DEIS's findings on potential cumulative effects to groundwater conductivity.
296.092	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		76. Sec 4.18.3.5, Page 4.18-41 - The discussion in Chapter 4.5 provides useful background information and analysis supporting the DEIS' cumulative effects conclusions. Consider cross-referencing or summarizing the relevant portions in this discussion. For example, the discussion at pages 4.5-17 to -19 includes a discussion of Navajo Mine's additions to TDS concentrations. The Water Resources/Hydrology Section includes a discussion of past CCB disposal, including monitoring wells, at Navajo Mine and CCR disposal at FCPP at pp. 4.5-13 to 17. This section also discusses past impacts from past CCB disposal at the Mine as addressed by OSMRE's CHIA, which concluded that negligible impacts had resulted from CCB disposal at the Mine and that it is unlikely that any significant future impacts will occur, because of the very slow groundwater movement and the lack of hydrologic connection. This section also discusses other studies that support the conclusion that CCB disposal at the Mine will have no impacts in the short- or long-term, and thus, by definition, cannot add to cumulative effects. This information is helpful to understanding the cumulative impacts analysis. Please consider cross-referencing this section, as well as other sections where CCB disposal is addressed.  Based on the analysis and studies discussed in the DEIS, we believe that the DEIS is overly conservative in concluding that, when considered cumulatively, all projects together could result in adverse cumulative effects. For example, the Water Resources/Hydrology section contains supportive information in the alternatives discussion at pages 4.5-43 to	Although the Draft EIS determines that the impacts of ash placement at FCPP and Navajo Mine are minor, it acknowledges a potential that the cumulative effects resulting from the incremental contributions from regional power plants and mines with CCR storage areas within the San Juan Basin may be moderate to major. According to the NEPA guidelines, the cumulative effects analysis is meant to evaluate the additive effects of the Proposed Action with other similar projects within the area of analysis. Although the Proposed Action has a minor effect, when taken together with other water quality stressors within the San Juan Basin the cumulative effect may be moderate to major. Therefore, the cumulative impacts section both 4.18.3.5 and 4.18.3.15, is correct in disclosing the potential for moderate to major adverse groundwater impacts from cumulative CCR storage operations. No change has been made to the Draft EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						4.5-45. We agree, however, with the conclusion that the Proposed Action's contribution would be minimal.	
296.093	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		<p>77. Sec 4.18.3.5, Page 4.18-42 - Consider clarifying this discussion to make clear that the cumulative effects analysis considers the impacts of Navajo Mine on surface waters and the impacts of similar projects, and the impacts of FCPP and impacts from similar projects on surface waters. For example, the Water Resources/Hydrology direct/indirect impacts section states that the ROI for surface waters includes areas within the deposition area of the FCPP, which appropriately acknowledges the impacts on surface water quality. The Surface Water Quality section of the direct and indirect impacts analysis contains useful background information, including historic water quality monitoring results, supporting the cumulative effects discussion. Also, consider cross-referencing the regulatory requirements section of Section 4.5.1, which sets out the regulatory compliance framework, including federal, state, and tribal requirements.</p> <p>The Water Resources/Hydrology Section provides information on the impacts of Waters of the US from the Proposed Action, for example, at pages 4.5-52-53. Consider cross-referencing.</p> <p>We agree with the conclusion that impacts on downstream surface water quality will be negligible. The Water Resources/Hydrology section contains supportive information in the alternatives discussion at pages 4.5-46 to 4.5-65.</p>	Although the Draft EIS determines that the impacts of CCR placement at FCPP and Navajo Mine are minor, it acknowledges a potential that the cumulative effects resulting from the incremental contributions from regional power plants and mines with CCR storage areas within the San Juan Basin may be moderate to major. According to the NEPA guidelines, the cumulative effects analysis is meant to evaluate the additive effects of the Proposed Action with other similar projects within the area of analysis. Although the Proposed Action has a minor effect, when taken together with other water quality stressors within the San Juan Basin the cumulative effect may be moderate to major. Therefore, the cumulative impacts section both 4.18.3.5 and 4.18.3.15, is correct in disclosing the potential for moderate to major adverse groundwater impacts from cumulative CCR storage operations. No change has been made to the Draft EIS.
296.094	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		<p>78. Sec 4.18.3.6, Page 4.18-43 - The Vegetation Section, 4.6, discusses past impacts from Navajo Mine and FCPP on vegetation. Consider cross-referencing.</p> <p>The discussion of habitat should be removed from this section, or cross-reference the next section, which specifically discusses habitat.</p>	The following reference has been added to Section 4.18.3.6 to guide the reader back to the potential direct effects to vegetative resources: "Please see Sections 4.6.3 and 4.6.4 for a discussion of potential project-related effects that were taken into account for assessing cumulative effects".
296.095	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		<p>79. Sec 4.18.3.7, Page 4.18-44 - Please ensure consistency between this discussion and the final BA, the BE for the Pinabete Permit Area (Ecosphere, 2014), the Navajo Mine BE (Ecosphere 2011), and the Biological Clearance Form for the Pinabete Permit Area (Navajo Fish and Wildlife, 2014).</p> <p>Section 4.7.2.1 discusses the affected environment pre-2014. Consider cross-referencing this discussion and other relevant information. BNCC undertook, and NTEC/MMCo will continue to undertake, many years of wildlife studies that inform this discussion and that are discussed in Section 4.7. Consider cross-referencing or summarizing those studies here. As with other resources, SMCRA and other federal statutes impose requirements, which minimize impacts on wildlife and their habitat. Consider cross-referencing Section 4.7.1, which discusses the regulatory compliance framework including federal, state, and tribal regulations, as well as regional plans.</p>	<p>4.18.3 has been updated for consistency with the BA and other project specific studies.</p> <p>Cross references have been added to Section 4.7.2.1 to direct the reader to the studies the applicants routinely conduct, as specified in the Project Description.</p> <p>Cumulative effects are not and will not be discussed in this section to avoid confusing the readers as to those effects related to the project vs. those effects from other sources. A brief mention of the cumulative impacts section 4.18.3 has been added.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						Chapter 4.7, Section 4.7.4 discusses the environmental consequences of the Proposed Action. Consider cross-referencing or summarizing as relevant and appropriate in the cumulative effects discussion. Consider adding a cross-reference to the Special Status Species section, which provides useful information on the potential of special status species to occur in the Project area based on studies, site visits, and modeling.	
296.096	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		<p>80. Sec 4.18.3.8, Page 4.18-44 - Please ensure consistency between this discussion and the final BA, the BE for the Pinabete Permit Area (Ecosphere, 2014), the Navajo Mine BE (Ecosphere 2011), and the Biological Clearance Form for the Pinabete Permit Area (Navajo Fish and Wildlife, 2014). The China worst case scenario in the cumulative effects section is a helpful summary of the more expanded discussion in the BA. The discussion in the BA demonstrates that the study included emissions from other generating stations, and not just FCPP.</p> <p>As with the wildlife and habitat section, BNCC has, and NTEC/MMCo will continue to, undertake annual wildlife surveys. The information in those surveys provides additional background information and analysis and should be referenced, included or summarized. Other sections of the DEIS contain information and analysis relevant to the DEIS' cumulative effects analysis. For example, OSM has in the past undertaken consultation with US FWS and the Navajo Nation regarding the SMCRA permit and is the lead agency, along with the other agencies, undertaking consultation on the Proposed Project, which Section 4.8 describes. As with other resources, SMCRA and other federal statutes impose requirements, which minimize impacts on special status species, which the Special Status Species section describes in Section 4.8.1.1. Chapter 4.8, Section 4.8.4 describes the impacts expected from the proposed action. Consider cross-referencing or summarizing those discussions here.</p>	This section has been reviewed and revised, as appropriate, based on this comment and others received from other commenters.
296.097	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		81. Sec 4.18.3.10, Page 4.18-50 - This section assumes adverse effect if the Proposed Action only affects employment, etc. The Proposed Action, if approved, will have beneficial impacts on socioeconomics. Consider rephrasing. Section 4.10 describes the current and future socioeconomic conditions in the Four Corners Region, which provides useful information for the cumulative effects analysis. Consider cross-referencing.	<p>The cumulative analysis for socioeconomic effects under the No Action alternative does consider a wider set of economic resources than solely employment, as stated: "Therefore, while the closure of FCPP and Navajo Mine would directly affect regional economic conditions, other future projects would positively contribute to the region's economic vitality and not result in a detrimental cumulative effect."</p> <p>The following reference has been added to Section 4.18.3.10 to guide the reader back to the potential direct effects to socioeconomic resources: "Please see Sections 4.10.3 and 4.10.4 for a discussion of potential project-related effects that were taken into account for assessing cumulative effects".</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.098	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		82. Sec 4.18.3.13, Page 4.18-51 - This section assumes adverse effect if the Proposed Action only affects employment, etc. The Proposed Action, if approved, will have beneficial impacts on socioeconomics. Consider rephrasing. Section 4.10 describes the current and future socioeconomic conditions in the Four Corners Region, which provides useful information for the cumulative effects analysis. Consider cross-referencing.	Comment noted.
296.099	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		83. Sec 4.18.3.15, Page 4.18-52 - The nature of impacts from historic CCB disposal at Navajo Mine is known and documented, and is described in other sections. The nature of the impacts should be included in this section as well. For example, the Hazardous Waste Section, Section 4-15, refers to Section 4.5.2.1 for a summary of the studies of the CCB disposal at Navajo Mine, which studies have not identified adverse effects.  MMCo does not agree with the conclusion that the impacts from CCB disposal at the Navajo Mine and FCPP are considered moderate to major and long term; rather, we think that the available data and analysis in the DEIS support the conclusion that impacts would be negligible to minor. As described in the Hazardous Waste section, the studies conducted at both Navajo Mine and FCPP have found that CCB disposal at the Navajo Mine has not caused adverse impacts, p. 4.15-5, and the Environmental Justice Section at pp. 4.11-23, states that there have only been two areas of seepage at FCPP, and that systems have been designed to prevent contamination of the Chaco wash and that groundwater data shows declines in all constituents.	Please see response to comment 296.094.
296.100	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		84. Sec 4.18.3.16, Page 4.18-53 - The No Action Alternative would negatively impact recreation on Morgan Lake, if Morgan Lake is no longer supplied with water. A discussion of the recreational value of the leased areas would be helpful in relation to how much hunting, trapping, fishing, and hiking occurs (or occurred in the past) on nearby land. Consider cross-referencing Section 4.16.2.2, which describes the limited project area recreation resources.	The following reference has been added to Section 4.18.3.16 to guide the reader back to the potential direct effects to recreational resources: "Please see Sections 4.16.3 and 4.16.4.2 for a discussion of potential project-related effects that were taken into account for assessing cumulative effects."  Section 4.16.2.1 includes a discussion of recreational resources in the surrounding area (i.e. on the Navajo Nation), in addition to those offered by Morgan Lake.
296.101	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		85. Sec 4.18.3.16, Page 4.18-53 - Is the "plume area of FCPP emissions" the same as the FCPP deposition area? Please clarify.  This last portion of this section discusses PM2.5 from the Navajo Mine but the first portion states that the Navajo Mine will not have an impact (and we agree). Consider clarifying. Section 4.17 provides useful information regarding the affected environment pre-2014, including a discussion of past health studies, and recent health risk assessments to evaluate the health effects from emissions from FCPP units 4 & 5. Consider cross-referencing.	It is assumed in the referenced context of the comment where in the cumulative public health analysis (Section 4.18.3.7), the Draft EIS states that "[t]he past and present cumulative risk was evaluated by soil sampling conducted within the footprint of the dispersion and deposition plume for FCPP" does mean the same geographic area.  The following reference has been added to Section 4.18.3.17 to guide the reader back to the potential direct effects to human health: "Please see Sections 4.17.3 and 4.17.4 for a discussion of potential project-related effects that were taken into account for assessing cumulative effects".

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.102	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		86. Sec 4.19, Page 4.19-1 - We agree with OMSRE's approach of not imposing additional mitigation measures where the Proposed Action itself includes applicant proposed measures, best management practices, and standard operating procedures that are expected to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse impacts or result in beneficial impacts. For example, see the applicant committed mitigation measures.	Comment noted.
296.103	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		87. Sec 5 - DEIS Chapter 5 would benefit from a clearer and more complete description of the ESA and NHPA Section 106 consultations, which have been extensive and conducted in parallel with the NEPA compliance effort. In addition, without disclosing any confidential discussions, the Chapter could also identify any government-to-government consultations with Native American groups, and consultations with any non-governmental organizations that may have occurred.	Section 5.1.3 has been updated with consultation activities that have occurred since publication of the DEIS.
296.104	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		88. Sec 5.1.1.2, Page 5-2 - BIA will also be considering rights-of-way applications for NTEC roads, in addition to ROWs for the FCPP.	Language added
296.105	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		89. Sec 5.1.1.2, Page 5-2 - 1 The Navajo Nation is the beneficial owner of surface and minerals. The United States holds legal title to surface and minerals. 2 Clarify what is meant by "exclusive and concurrent" authority and responsibility. Consider striking the reference to "exclusive."	Changed this: "The Navajo Nation is the owner of both the surface and coal resources lying beneath Navajo Nation land impacts by the Project." to this: "The Navajo Nation is the beneficial owner of surface and minerals lying beneath Navajo Nation lands impacted by this Project; whereas the United States holds legal title to surface and minerals." The "exclusive and concurrent" statement remains unchanged.
296.106	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		90. Sec 5, Page 5-2 - To avoid confusion regarding BLM's role relative to OSMRE's role, consider inserting "Resource Recovery and Protection Plan (R2P2)" instead of the more generic "mining plans."	BLM has regulatory authority and approval for mining plans of operations issues relating to coal resource recovery and protection. No change required.
296.107	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		91. Sec 5.1.3, Page 5-4 - The ESA and NHPA consultations also meet the regulatory requirements of those statutes as well. Consider broadening the reference to NEPA at the end of the paragraph to include the other statutes.	No change made.
296.108	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		1. Global - Tables 3-8, 3-9, and 3-11 accurately describe the length of primary and ancillary roads associated with Alternatives A, B, and C. For clarification, MMCo suggests that the DEIS text describing road lengths be harmonized with these tables.	The Final EIS has been reviewed to ensure that numbers from Tables 3-8, 3-9, and 3-11 are used throughout.
296.109	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		2. Sec 1.1.1, Page 1-1 - BHP Billiton New Mexico Coal created BHP Billiton Mine Management Company (MMCo). MMCo suggests revising the verb tense in Section 1.1.1. of the DEIS on page 1-1 to indicate this as past action and make this change, as appropriate, throughout the Final EIS.	Tense corrected here and checked throughout.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.110	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	3. Sec 1.2, Page 1-3 - Please correct the following distances cited in the text discussing the Navajo Mine lease: <del>39 miles</del> 24 miles and <del>28 miles</del> 18 miles.	Change made
296.111	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	4. Sec 2.1.1, Page 2-5 - In the first sentence under the heading "Workforce", please change the sentence to read: "BHP Billiton Mine Management Company (MMCo) employs approximately 526 people at the mine site and Farmington office."	Change made.
296.112	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	5. Sec 2.2, Page 2-6 - Please delete the first paragraph under Figure 2-2 discussing underground mines in the Navajo Mine Lease Area because there are no abandoned underground mines within the Navajo mine lease area.	Change made
296.113	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	6. Sec 2.1.2, Page 2-6 - Please correct Figure 2-2 to show Navajo Mine and FCPP are located west of Farmington.	The inset on figure 2-2 has been modified such that the mine and power plant are located to the west of Farmington
296.114	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	7. Sec 2.1, Page 2-7 - Recommend adding a new bullet # 8 to state that – "Repeat steps 5 through 7 for each minable seam".	Change made.
296.115	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	8. Sec 2.1.2.6, Page 2-12 - Note that the Burns Pass Temporary stockpile is not placed at a railroad spur as are the other field stockpiles.	Comment noted.
296.116	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	9. Sec 2.1.2.6, Page 2-12 - Please replace "MMCo employees" with "New Mexico Coal employees".	The Draft EIS already says New Mexico Coal employees.
296.117	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	10. Sec 2.1.4, Page 2-13 - Please correct the text to identify that the coal preparation facility is owned by NTEC and is within the Navajo Mine SMCRA permit area.	The Draft EIS does not say it is not owned by NTEC. Text inserted.
296.118	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	11. Sec 2.1.6, Page 2-15 - Please change 2010 to 2009 in the last paragraph on page 2-15.	Change made.
296.119	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	12. Sec 2.1.7, Page 2-16 - Please replace "Navajo Mine" with "NTEC" in the following sentence: "Under NTEC's lease agreement with the Navajo Nation and NTEC's OSMRE SMCRA permit,..."	Change made.
296.120	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	13. Sec 2.1.7, Page 2-16 - Please change calcium sulfate formula from "CaSO3" to "CaSO4".	Change made.
296.121	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	14. Sec 2.2.6.2, Page 2-25 - Please change December 31, 2014 to December 30, 2013.	Change made.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.122	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	15. Sec 2.4.1, Page 2-34 - Permit 2838 has already been transferred to BHP Billiton New Mexico Coal (BBNMC).	Discussion edited as follows to reflect transfer of permit 2838: Prior to sale of NMCC, LLC's equity to NTEC, BNCC, the previous owner of Permit 2838, transferred its ownership interest in Permit 2838 to BBNMC. BBNMC will honor all existing contractual commitments for water deliveries (BNCC/NTEC/APS 2013).
296.123	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	16. Sec 3.2.1.1, Page 3-3 - The existing SMCRA permit area contains approximately 18,520 acres and not 20,590 acres.	Text revised.
296.124	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	17. Sec 3.2.1.1, Page 3-9 - Please replace 2039 with 2041 in the second paragraph after Table 3-5.	Change made.
296.125	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	18. Sec 3.2.1.1, Page 3-10 - Replace "support facilities" with "buildings".	Support Facility has been replaced with "buildings" in the first and last sentences of the Paragraph.
296.126	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	19. Sec 3.2.6.5, Page 3-36 - Please change quantity to quality.	Change made.
296.127	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	20. Sec 3.2.6.9, Page 3-44 - There are no BIA requirements for grazing compensation and that language should be stricken.	Change made.
296.128	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	21. Sec 3.2.6.10, Page 3-44 - Please change the verb tense in the following sentence: NTEC has implemented a Native American hiring and vendor preference policy.	Change made.
296.129	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	22. Sec 3.3.4.4, Page 3-54 - Remove the bullet regarding revision to a Navajo Mine air emissions permit because the Navajo Mine is not required to have an air emissions permit.	Change made.
296.130	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	23. Table 3-11, Page 3-57 - Correct the Table 3-11 headings to match the titles of the alternatives used in the text.	Change made.
296.131	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	24. Sec 4.1, Page 4.1-1 - For completeness, add O3 to the list of criteria pollutants.	Change made.
296.132	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	25. Sec 4.1.1, Page 4.1-2 - The first paragraph states that Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico and Utah adopted NAAQS in lieu of more stringent state standards. However, New Mexico has adopted its own state ambient air standards (regulation 20.2.3NMAC) which may be different or in addition to NAAQS. An example of the more stringent state standard adopted by New Mexico is the 24-hr average standard for NO2. There is not a federal 24-hr standard for NO2.	While the comment is true, the New Mexico Environment Department Air Quality Bureau does not have jurisdiction over facilities on Tribal Lands. In the interest of consistency across the tribal lands and two states, the Air Quality analysis in the EIS makes comparisons against the National Ambient Air Quality Standards. Mentioning the differences for New Mexico standards would be informational, but would not change the analysis or the conclusions of the EIS.  No change was made to the EIS based on this comment.
296.133	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	26. Sec 4.2.4.1, Page 4.2-19 - Please provide the emissions factors used to calculate the GHG emissions.	Section 4.2.2.2, Greenhouse Gases, provides the Global Warming Potential factor used for each GHG to quantify Carbon Dioxide Equivalents in the referenced table. No change was made to the EIS based on this comment.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.134	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	27. Sec 4.2.4.5, Page 4.2-23 - Under Alternative E, please change “undefined” to “defined” in the last line.	Change made
296.135	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	28. Sec 4.2.5, Page 4.2-24 - In the fourth line from the bottom of the first paragraph, please change “implanting” to “implementing”.	Change made
296.136	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	29. Sec 4.3, Page 4.3-1 - MMCo provides the following narrative to support the discussion of the last three sentences in the first paragraph to describe the proposed land disturbance: “The Pinabete Permit Area is wholly contained within the Navajo Mine mining Lease Area and is comprised of portions of the currently permitted Area IV North (Navajo Mine SMCRA Permit Area) (OSM Permit No. NM-0003F) and a portion of the unpermitted Area IV South (BNCC 2012). The planned land disturbances would occur only within the previously unmined areas of the Navajo Mine SMCRA Permit Area and Pinabete Permit Area (portions of Area IV North and Area IV South) and the FCPP lease area. Other than what is described in the Proposed Action, no additional land disturbances are planned within other portions of the Navajo Mine Lease Area, the FCPP lease area, or beneath the seven transmission lines with the exception of on-going reclamation and maintenance activities.”	Have modified as follows:  The Pinabete Permit Area is wholly contained within the Navajo Mine Lease Area, located south of the Navajo Mine Permit Area (BNCC 2012)... with the exception of on-going reclamation and maintenance activities.
296.137	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	30. Figures 4.3-3, -4, & -5 - MMCo recommends removing the references and placeholders for confidential Figures 4.3-3, 4.3-4, 4.3-5 from the DEIS.	The placeholders for confidential Figures 4.3-3, 4.3-4 and 4.3-5 and their associated in text citations have been removed from the document
296.138	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	31. Sec 4.3.2.2, Page 4.3-4 - Please clarify the descriptions of the following physical features:  • The San Juan River is an important surface water feature and needs to be identified as a landform or topographic feature.  • The Pinabete Diversion (Area IV South) should be removed from this figure as it would only be built as a component of Alternative B.  • The No Name Arroyo (Area IV South) continues to the Chaco River. In Figure 4.3-1, please identify No Name Arroyo within the Navajo Mine lease and the unnamed tributary to the west of the Navajo Mine lease as the No Name Arroyo.	The Following modifications have been made to figure 4.3-1 1.) A label for the San Juan River has been added to the figure 2.) The Pinabete Diversion has been removed 3.) No Name Arroyo has been added to figure
296.139	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	32. Sec 4.3.2.3, Page 4.3-7 - The text describes the multiple site specific surveys within the Navajo Mine Lease Area, and information contained in the associated reports (Buchanan Consultants 2011). However, Figure 4.3-2 is based on the NRCS SSURGO data set and does not relate back to the text description. The BNCC Soils Resource Baseline Data reports submitted in June 2012 provided site-specific surveys for the Navajo Mine Lease Area and region surveys conducted by the NRCS. The DEIS mentions both the regional and site specific surveys. However the discussion of the different scales of the surveys can be improved to better lead into the regional scale mapping found on Figure 4.3-2.	Description has been modified to tie the figure and text better.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.140	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	33. Sec 4.3.4.5, Page 4.3-27 - The DEIS states, "A slight permanent alteration in topographic relief would occur compared to the pre-mine conditions. These impacts are considered minor." We agree with the conclusion that the impacts would only be considered minor and note that reclamation designed to approximate original contours using geomorphic reclamation practices is not considered a "permanent alteration" but is a demonstrated enhancement of landform stability.	No change made. Geomorphic reclamation may be an enhancement of landform stability compared to traditional reclamation; however, it would be a stretch to globally say that geomorphic reclamation is an enhancement over the non-disturbed land.
296.141	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	34. Sec 4.4, Page 4.4-1 - Please add in Section 4.4 that cultural resources are not necessarily the same as "historic properties", as that term is used in the NHPA, because not all cultural resources are eligible for or included in the NRHP.	This section does not imply that cultural resources = historic properties. No change made.
296.142	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	35. Sec 4.5.1.3, Page 4.5-5 - The acute and chronic aquatic criteria for chromium II and zinc listed in Table 4.5-2 do not correspond with the criteria calculated using the hardness value of 108 mg/l as CaCO <sub>3</sub> . The acute and chronic aquatic criteria for chromium III in the table should be 0.6068 and 0.0789 mg/l, respectively. The acute and chronic aquatic criteria for zinc in the table should be 0.12508 and 0.1261 mg/l, respectively.	The table has been revised accordingly
296.143	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	36. Sec 4.5.2.1, Page 4.5-7 - MMCo suggests the following changes to Figure 4.5-1 to augment the information provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add all of the Navajo Mine alluvial monitoring wells in Area IV to the figure.</li> <li>• Add coal seam wells KF98-02 and KF98-04 in Area IV South to Figure 4.5-1. Also add Piezometer VWP2007-01, located near the boundary between Area IV North and Area IV South, Figure 4.5-1.</li> <li>• Remove the word "Monitoring" from the legend describing the wells. While some of the wells may be used for monitoring, most of the wells were installed for livestock watering.</li> <li>• Modify the "perennial" symbol for the Chaco River. The Chaco River exhibits ephemeral channel characteristics until the confluence with the unnamed tributary exiting Morgan Lake. Downstream of the confluence with the unnamed tributary, the Chaco River exhibits perennial channel characteristics</li> </ul>	The following edits have been added to Figure 4.5-1 1.) Missing alluvial wells have been added 2.) Piezometer VWP2007-01 has been added to the figure and labeled 3.) Coal seam wells KF98-02 and KF98-04 in Area IV South have been added to the figure and labeled 4.) The word "Monitoring" was removed from the legend headers (i.e. Navajo Mine Monitoring Wells and Navajo Nation Monitoring Wells) 5.) Upstream of Morgan lake the Chaco River has been changed to the "intermittent stream" type "symbol" 6.) CCR monitoring wells have been added to Areas I and II.
296.144	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	37. Sec 4.5.2.1, Page 4.5-9 - The last sentence on the page could be clarified to state that "Only one of the coal seam wells, well KF2007-01 completed in the No. 8 Coal in Area IV South, has sufficient yield to allow for a constant rate pumping test to determine hydraulic characteristics of the coal."	Comment noted, does not affect analysis.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.145	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	<p>38. Sec 4.5.2.1, Page 4.5-10 - Please add the test results for transmissivity and hydraulic conductivity for well KF2007-01 (completed in the No. 8 Coal Seam in Area IV South) to Table 4.5-4. The well results are transmissivity 1.398 ft<sup>2</sup>/day and hydraulic conductivity 0.056 ft/day. For clarification, MMCo suggests the following footnotes to Table 4.5-4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These test results are only for the No. 8 Coal Seam wells within Area IV North and Area IV South.</li> <li>• The test results for the No 2, No.4-6, and the No. 7 coal seams are from wells located within Area III.</li> <li>• The Pictured Cliffs Sandstone results include tests at wells within Area IV North, Area IV South, Area V and adjacent to Area V.</li> </ul> <p>Additionally, Table 18.2-6 of the Pinabete SMCRA Permit application package provides transmissivity results for Fruitland coal seams 2, 4-6, and 7 (BNCC 2012a). For clarification, MMCo suggests adding the following transmissivity results of 0.009 to 0.1 ft<sup>2</sup>/day for seam 2, 0.01 ft<sup>2</sup>/day for seam 4-6 and 0.01 to 0.04 ft<sup>2</sup>/day for seam 7 to Table 4.5-4.”</p>	Comment noted, requested changes made, does not affect analysis.
296.146	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	<p>39. Sec 4.5.2.1, Page 4.5-13 - Please clarify the last sentence to read: “While slight upward gradients from the PCS to the Fruitland formation occur at a few locations, the gradients are generally downward from the Fruitland to the PCS”.</p>	Cannot find where this is to be changed, and does not affect analysis. No change made.
296.147	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	<p>40. Sec 4.5, Page 4.5-13 to -17 - The DEIS here presents a detailed discussion of the potential impacts of the placement of coal combustion byproducts (CCBs) and coal combustion residue (CCR) and should be referenced in other sections of the DEIS, such as 4.15 Hazardous, &amp; Solid Waste and 4.18 Cumulative Effects.</p>	Sections 4.15 and 4.18 now reference this section.
296.148	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	<p>41. Sec 4.5.2.1, Page 4.5-14 - The DEIS text in section 4.5.2.1 discusses water quality characteristics of the Cottonwood, Pinabete, and No Name arroyos. Please clarify that this is alluvial ground water quality characteristics of the saturated alluvium along these arroyos and not surface water quality characteristics.</p>	It is in the groundwater section, thus no clarification necessary.
296.149	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	<p>42. Sec 4.5.2.1, Page 4.5-18 - Field reconnaissance or review of State of New Mexico and Navajo Nation water well records document that there are no alluvial livestock groundwater wells in the No Name Arroyo. Also, the No Name Arroyo alluvial groundwater is limited, intermittent and the quality is unsuitable for livestock use.</p>	Both the EIS and commenter agree that the groundwater does not meet livestock watering criteria. The statement that there are no alluvial livestock groundwater wells in No Name Wash Arroyo within the lease area is true. However, the CHIA assessed the water quality of several alluvial washes against the NNEPA livestock water quality criteria. Based on that review against surface water quality criteria for livestock, alluvial groundwater is unsuitable for livestock watering. While there were some historical attempts to use alluvial groundwater for livestock watering (mainly in the Chaco), the sentence has been revised to indicate that the alluvium is not currently used for that purpose.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.150	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	43. Sec 4.5.2.1, Page 4.5-19 - Table 4.5-5 indicates that arsenic, barium cadmium, chromium, copper, lead, mercury selenium, silver, uranium and zinc were not sampled at the Fruitland coal wells; however, these constituents were analyzed in 6 samples from well KF98-01 and from 5 samples from well KF2007-01 obtained in 2007 and 2008. These values are provided in the Pinabete SMCRA Permit Application Package (BNCC 2012a).	Table updated using the samples from well KF2007-01. No mention of KF 98-01 in section 18 of the PAP.
296.151	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	44. Sec 4.5.2.2, Page 4.5-21 - Navajo Reservoir is not located on the Navajo Nation. The northern end of Navajo Reservoir extends into Colorado. The Southern Ute reservation extends along the northwest side of the reservoir.	Deleted "on the Navajo Nation"
296.152	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	45. Sec 4.5.2.2, Page 4.5-27 - Either revise the title of Table 4.5-7 to include "Intermittent and ephemeral drainages within or in proximity to the Pinabete Permit Area" (emphasis added), or remove the No Name Arroyo values from Table 4.5-7. The No Name Arroyo is not within the Pinabete Permit area.	Have added "... in proximity to..."
296.153	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	46. Sec 4.5, Page 4.5-29 - Figure 4.5-6 Jurisdictional Waters of the US within the Pinabete Permit Area displays both jurisdictional and non-jurisdictional drainages as the same map symbol. Please display the non-jurisdictional drainages as a separate line symbol. See Appendix B (USCOE draft permit evaluation document) for example.	Both jurisdictional and non-jurisdictional Waters of the US are depicted with the same symbol on figure 4.5-6; however, jurisdictional waters are depicted in blue and non-jurisdictional waters are depicted in purple. As such, it is not necessary to modify the figure.
296.154	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	47. Sec 4.5.2.2, Page 4.5-29 - To enhance the reader's understanding of the Project area, we suggest the following revisions to Figure 4.5-6. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dixon Pit is in the southern portion of Area III, not Area IV North;</li> <li>• Gilmore pit is in Area IV North;</li> <li>• The sediment ponds are proposed features that would be constructed as part of the Pinabete Permit, they are not existing structures;</li> <li>• The "unnamed arroyo" is actually the No Name Arroyo described in the text;</li> <li>• "Pinabeta" Arroyo should be "Pinabete".</li> </ul> Please see MMCo/NTEC's December 2013 response to OSMRE Technical evaluations for pond names.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Dixon Pit label has been moved into Area III</li> <li>2) Gilmore Pit has been added to Area IV N</li> <li>3) The figure pertains to both existing and proposed structures – no change made.</li> <li>4) Unnamed Arroyo changed to No Name Arroyo</li> <li>5) Pinabete Arroyo typo corrected</li> </ol>
296.155	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	48. Sec 4.5.2.2, Page 4.5-31 - The Chinde Wash monitoring stations upstream of Navajo Mine are not upstream of all indirect seepage from NAPI irrigation.	The document does not indicate that they are upstream of all indirect seepage. In fact, it indicates just the opposite. No change made.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.156	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	49. Sec 4.5, Page 4.5-32 - Reference to "SJ-2917" should be changed to SJ-2197. For clarification please state that the "SJ-2197" water permit is to allow San Juan Coal Company to pump ground water from the underground San Juan Mine. BBNMC Permit 2838 water right provides water for use at FCPP and Navajo Mine.	Removed the reference to SJ-2197 from the paragraph since it refers to water use for the San Juan Mine and not the Navajo Mine
296.157	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	50. Sec 4.5, Page 4.5-34 - The third sentence in the paragraph under the heading "Water Use", should be deleted as the FCPP is not the owner of the water rights.	Sentence deleted.
296.158	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	51. Sec 4.5, Page 4.5-37 - Current Navajo Nation Water Quality standards are based on dissolved chromium and dissolved lead, rather than total chromium and total lead.	Figures updated accordingly.
296.159	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	52. Sec 4.5.4.1, Page 4.5-44 - Ground water sampling of the Chaco River alluvial aquifer is not required by the Navajo Mine SMCRA permit or included in the Pinabete SMCRA Permit Application Package ground water monitoring plans.	Removed Chaco River from the sentence
296.160	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	53. Sec 4.5.4.1, Page 4.5-44 - Please note in the second paragraph under "Groundwater Quality Impacts", that the Navajo Nation does not include irrigation in its 2008 Surface Water Quality standards and thus "irrigation" should be deleted from this sentence.	changed "irrigation" to "agricultural water supply" which is the term used in the standards.
296.161	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	54. Sec 4.5, Page 4.5-44 - "As shown in Table 4.5-5, a comparison of monitoring data from wells within the areas of CCR placement to the baseline Fruitland coals (see Figure 4.5-2)..." This paragraph as written implies a comparison of data from wells within CCR placement areas to baseline Fruitland coal wells. However, Table 4.5-5 does not provide that comparison. Recommend removing "As shown in Table 4.5-5" from the sentence or adding a new table that shows the comparison.	"As shown in Table 4.5-5" deleted.
296.162	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	55. Sec 4.5, Page 4.5-44 - "Median" values are discussed and Table 4.5-5 is referenced but reports averages (means) not median values. Recommend eliminating the reference to Table 4.5-5 and referencing BNCC 2012a.	Removed reference to table 4.5-5. Added table on page 4.5-44 comparing median values of monitoring data within areas of CCR placement to baseline fruitland coals.
296.163	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	56. Sec 4.5, Page 4.5-45 - In the last sentence on page 4.5-45 it states "Transport to the north and east is limited." Consider adding "by the low hydraulic conductivity of the Picture Cliff Sandstone (PCS)" to the end of this sentence.	The entire paragraph references the PCS, therefore no change necessary.
296.164	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	57. Sec 4.5.4.1, Page 4.5-46 - The DEIS discussion about surface waters would benefit from including more references to Appendix C – the USACE Draft 404(b) Alternatives Analysis.	Added "Appendix C includes the USACE 404B Alternatives Analysis for the submitted permit application" to the end of the sub-section titled "Impacts to Waters of the US".

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.165	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	58. Sec 4.5, Page 4.5-46 - MMCo has provided updated technical evaluation responses to OSM for the Pinabete permit based on a revised post-mining topography. The current SEDCAD results differ from those identified in Tables 4.5-12 and 4.5-15, and are attached as Tables 41.3-4 and 41.3-5. Please note that while projections of post-mine yields are slightly higher than pre-mine yields, the values are insignificant and within the error projections associated with the model.	Table 4.5-15 has been updated accordingly
296.166	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	59. Sec 4.5.4.1, Page 4.5-52 - For clarification, as stated in the Pinabete Permit Application Part 6 Section 42 Monitoring Maintenance Inspections and Examinations: Surface water quality and quantity monitoring would be conducted at five stations (three historic and two new stations) and would be collected quarterly in accordance with the Surface Water Monitoring Plan submitted as part of the Pinabete Permit.	Comment noted.
296.167	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	60. Sec 4.5.4.1, Page 4.5-52 - Please ensure consistency between the DEIS and the USACE's Table 4 in Appendix C [Preliminary Draft Pinabete Permit Evaluation]. The USACE's Table 4 accurately describes the shorter length and smaller area of Waters of the US (WUS) delineated in Pinabete Permit area. The USACE 404(b)(1) Alternatives Analysis, Appendix C, states approximately 16.2 miles 29.0 acres of WUS are within the Pinabete Permit SMCRA area.  The proposed Pinabete Permit SMCRA area will not impact any WUS, or other drainage features within the No Name Arroyo watershed. All of the WUS impacted will be within the Cottonwood Arroyo and Pinabete Arroyo watersheds. No impacts will occur to wetlands or other special aquatic sites.	Sentence has been updated accordingly
296.168	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	61. Sec 4.5, Page 4.5-54 - The following addition would add clarity for the reader: "The SEDCAD results indicate that peak flows and runoff volumes to Pinabete and Cottonwood arroyos would be reduced during operations with maximum disturbance acreages representing worst-case projections."	Sentence revised to include "maximum disturbance acreages representing"
296.169	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	62. Sec 4.5.4.1, Page 4.5-55 - In the first paragraph on the discussion on Channel Morphology, consider noting that impacts to channel pattern and geometry will be major during mining activities (since channels will be mined through), but those impacts will be negligible or even beneficial following reclamation activities.	The text already states that "Changes in runoff or in sediment yield from watershed affected by mining...cause major changes in the existing channel pattern and geomtry.....the impact of the mine on the geometry, morphology, or location of the natural stream patterns is expected to be negligible post-reclamation."
296.170	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	63. Sec 4.5.4.2, Page 4.5-60 - In the surface water resources discussion in Alternative B, please revise the last sentence to clarify that the mitigation plan for impact the Waters of the US (WUS) would only be submitted to the USACE.	Change made.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.171	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	64. Sec 4.5, Page 4.5-60 - To further support the analysis MMCo recommends the following discussion be added to Alternative B: "Engineering for the Pinabete diversion would be designed to minimize additional downcutting in No Name Arroyo by attenuation of peak flows from the diversion and stabilizing the No Name Channel at existing head cut locations downstream of the diversion. Reconstruction of Pinabete Arroyo post mining would include geomorphic reclamation strategies designed to emulate the pre-mine channel."	Change made.
296.172	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	65. Sec 4.5.4.2, Page 4.5-60 - MMCo agrees that Alternatives A & B would have similar impacts on the ground water and surface water. However, MMCo believes there would be subtle differences between the two alternatives, such as mining through Pinabete Arroyo and its alluvial ground water in Alternative B. The channel design of the reconstructed Pinabete Arroyo incorporates design features to mitigate the effects of mining to the alluvial ground water post-reclamation.	Changed the end of the paragraph as follows: Groundwater impacts due to the diversion would be negligible because the channel design of the reconstructed Pinabete Arroyo would incorporate design features to reduce the effect of mining to the alluvial groundwater post-reclamation; therefore, impacts to groundwater quantity and quality during operation would be as described for the Proposed Action. Operation and reclamation activities would be similar to those described for the Proposed Action, except that the mine plan would involve mining through Pinabete Arroyo.
296.173	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	66. Sec 4.5.4.2, Page 4.5-61 - For clarification, the Navajo Mine SMCRA Permit and the Pinabete SMCRA Permit, if issued, do not have an "Erosion Control and Sediment Plan" as described in the DEIS. Rather they have drainage and sediment control plans. In the Navajo Mine SMCRA Permit these plans are found in Chapter 11. In the Pinabete SMCRA Permit Application, the proposed Sediment and Drainage Control Plans are found in Part 4, Section 25 and Section 26, respectively.	Have clarified.
296.174	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	67. Sec 4.5.4.5, Page 4.5-63 - During demolition and reclamation activities, NTEC would maintain the same level of BMPs and sediment control as during mining operations. There would be no change in its management of surface water or ground water during reclamation activities.	Have clarified.
296.175	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	68. Sec 4.6.1, Page 4.6-1 - Please note that the Navajo Nation does not have a noxious weed list as stated in the DEIS.	Navajo Nation removed from the list
296.176	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	69. Sec 4.6.2.1, Page 4.6-2 - Please delete the reference to the "Society for Range Management's 1974 Range Management, 2nd Edition"; this is not a valid reference. Vegetation communities were mapped and characterized using the standard sampling method Point intercept method along a 30 or 50 meter transect. This method was used for the Navajo Mine, Pinabete Permit Area, and Burnham Road realignment.	Reference deleted. Deleted also in references as this is the only instance of this citation.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.177	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	70. Sec 4.8, Page 4.8-2 - The description of the timing and process for formal consultation in this paragraph is not consistent with the ESA consultation schedule for the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine Energy Project (FCPPNMEP). Please update this paragraph based on the overall FCPPNMEP project schedule, including Section 7.	Updated
296.178	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	71. Figure 4.9-1, Page 4.9-5 - Based on Figure 4.9-1, the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine Lease and rights-of-way, excluding the transmission lines, do not intersect only the San Juan Chapter.	Figure 4.9.1 has been updated and text has been revised.
296.179	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	72. Sec 4.9.2.1, Page 4.9-7 - For clarification, the nearest NAPI field to the Navajo Mine Lease Area is located near Area I (approximately <0.01 mi away).	Corrected.
296.180	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	73. Sec 4.9.2.1, Page 4.9-7 - Section 2.1 provides a detailed description of the current and historic mining activities in the Navajo Mine Lease Area. MMCo recommends that this description be carried through the other FEIS sections such as Section 4.9.2.1.	This section has been updated to reference Section 2.1, where applicable.
296.181	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	74. Sec 4.9.2.1, Page 4.9-7 - For clarification the proposed Burnham Road realignment is wholly with in the Nenahnezad Chapter boundaries and does not intersect the Tiis Tsoh Sikaad (Burnham) or San Juan Chapter boundaries.	Clarified.
296.182	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	75. Sec 4.9.2.1, Page 4.9-8 - For clarification the Pinabete Permit Area only intersects two Navajo Nation Chapters; Tiis Tsoh Sikaad (Burnham) and Nenahnezad.	Clarified.
296.183	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	76. Sec 4.9.2.2, Page 4.9-12 - The DEIS make a references an "Area IV" of the Navajo Mine Lease. Area IV North and Area IV South are unique resource areas within the Navajo Mine Lease Area and should be called out individually. NTEC/MMCo does not recognize a combined "Area IV" resource area.	Clarified globally.
296.184	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	77. Sec 4.9.2.2, Page 4.9-12 - For clarification roads open for public use within the Navajo Mine Lease area are; Ramp 7 (North in Area I), Table Mesa Road (BIA N-4104) and the Burnham Road. All other road intersecting within the Mine lease are control and not open the public transportation.	Clarified.
296.185	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	78. Sec 4.9.2.2, Page 4.9-12 - For clarification, MMCo completed a permanent reroute of the Burnham Road (N-5082) in July and August 2012. This reroute eliminated the portion of the road with a 20 MPH sharp curve. The permanent reroute is designed to BIA road specification for all weather travel with proper drainage. The permanent reroute has also diverted traffic away from mining activities in Area III.	Clarified.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.186	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	79. Sec 4.9.2.2, Page 4.9-12 - For clarification the last sentence on page 4.9-12 should be revised to read: "Equipment weighing less than 25 tons can be delivered directly to the Area III industrial facilities...." There are no facilities in Area IV North or South.	Clarified.
296.187	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	80. Sec 4.9.2.2, Page 4.9-16 - As accurately noted in the DEIS Section 2.1.4, the railroad is owned by NTEC and is within the Navajo Mine Lease and associated ROWs. This ownership should be reflected in section 4.9.2.2	Clarified.
296.188	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	81. Sec 4.9.4.1, Page 4.9-18 - For clarification, 30 CFR 761.14 does not require NTEC to develop resource protection measures to eliminate, minimize, and/or mitigate any effects on public roads. 30 CFR 761.14 requires the OSMRE designated road authority to determine if the interests of the public and landowners will be protected and describes the public comment process the road authority must follow. (See Section 3.2.1.1 comment on the "Road Authority" designation).	Clarified.
296.189	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	82. Sec 4.18.3.9, Page 4.18-49 - The DEIS appropriately includes several projects within the boundary of the Navajo Nation however, the San Juan Generating Station and the Animas-La Plata project are located outside the boundary of the Navajo Nation.	The San Juan Generating Station and the Animas-La Plata project were deleted
296.190	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	83. Sec 4.10.3.2, Page 4.10-25 - In table 4.10-25 replace "Navajo Mine" with "FCPP."	The 2 rows have been changed to say "FCPP"
296.191	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	84. Sec 4.10.3.2, Page 4.10-27 - In the first sentence please change "fiscal contribution of Navajo Mine to NTEC" to "fiscal contribution of Navajo Mine to the Navajo Nation."	Change made.
296.192	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	85. Sec 4.11, Page 4.11-2 - It appears that McKinley County is within the ROI as shown in Figure 4.11-1 and 4.11-2. Please include McKinley County within the paragraph on Page 4.11-2 Region of Influence.	Change made.
296.193	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	86. Sec 4.11.1.2, Page 4.11-6 - The DEIS text in section 4.11.1.2 references pink highlighting to indicate environmental justice low income populations on Figure 4.11-2. Please include the highlighted references on Figure 4.11-2.	The labels for each census block have been highlighted pink and the pink label symbol has been added to the legend to reduce confusion.
296.194	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	87. Sec 4.12.2.2, Page 4.12-2 - For clarification there will be approximately 50 miles of proposed power lines within Navajo Mine Lease area. This should be reflected in appropriate sections of the DEIS.	This section refers to existing infrastructure on Navajo Mine. Text has been revised as follows: Infrastructure and associated activities related to the Navajo Mine on Navajo Nation trust land include surface coal mining, reclamation activities, access roads, haul roads, a proposed 6.3 mile transmission line ( <u>for a total of approximately 50 miles of transmission lines within the lease area</u> ), a 15-mile railroad, and coal handling facilities.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.195	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	88. Sec 4.12.4.1, Page 4.12-4 - The following sentences on page 4.12-4 state; Under Alternative A, the coal would be mined subject to proposed Lease Amendment #3 between the Navajo Mine and the Navajo Nation. The Secretary of the Interior must ensure that Lease Amendment #3 meets the objectives of established Federal trust management policies so that the action is in the best interest of the Navajo Nation and Federal Government (25 CFR 211.3). Amendment No. 3 is between APS and the Navajo Nation. These sentences should be deleted as they do not apply to Navajo Mine.	Change made.
296.196	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	89. Sec 4.12.4.1, Page 4.12-7 - In regards to compensating the land user for the use of a CUA during mining, NTEC negotiates with the holder of the CUA not the Navajo Nation. The Navajo Nation is a witness to the negotiation.	Clarified.
296.197	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	90. Sec 4.12.4.1, Page 4.12-7 - The reference to the DFADAs should be deleted from this paragraph because the construction of DFADAs is an FCPP proposed action on the FCPP lease, and not an NTEC proposed action.	Deleted.
296.198	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	91. Sec 4.12.4.2, Page 4.12-11 - NTEC's SMCRA permits for the Navajo Mine Permit Area and the proposed Alternative B permit would specify a primary post mining land use of livestock grazing and a secondary post-mining land use of wildlife habitat. The reclaimed lands would not be designed or constructed for a post-mining land use of agriculture. The post-mining land use of livestock grazing and wildlife habitat are consistent with pre-mine land uses within the Navajo Mine lease area.	Clarified.
296.199	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	92. Sec 4.12.4.3, Page 4.12-12 - Section 4.4 defines "Cultural Resources" as "prehistoric and historic resources archeological resources (e.g., sites and isolated finds), historic resources (e.g., buildings, structures, objects, and districts), and properties of religious and cultural significance, including Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs)." Given this definition, would it be better to refer here to "cultural resources" rather than "pre-historic resources"? In addition, please consider whether the NHPA Section 106 term "historic properties" should be added to the definition of "cultural resources" in Section 4.4?	Changes made
296.200	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	93. Sec 4.12.4.5, Page 4.12-14 - MMCo has mitigated all sites in Area III and IV North. If the No Action Alternative is chosen there would be no new land disturbance and consequently, reclamation activities would not impact new cultural resources.	Clarified.
296.201	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	94. Sec 4.12.4.5, Page 4.12-14 - It is unclear why the discussion of the two paleontological resources occurring in the pre-2016 dragline areas is in the discussion of the No Action Alternative. Please clarify. If they will be impacted under other alternatives, this information should appear in those discussions.	Change made

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
296.202	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	95. Sec 4.15.2.1, Page 4.15-7 - MMCo does not refer to the mine backfill areas as Dry Fly Ash Disposal Areas or DFADAs. DFADA is a FCPP specific term. CCB material was placed in mine backfill areas of Navajo Mine.	Clarified
296.203	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	96. Sec 4.15.2.1, Page 4.15-7 - The DEIS correctly notes that MMCo has not filed a TRI Report since 2008, because MMCo stopped receiving CCBs from FCPP in 2008. Once MMCo stopped receiving CCBs from FCPP, it no longer met the reporting requirements of the TRI Program.	Comment noted.
296.204	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	97. Sec 4.15.4.2; 4.15.4.3, Pages 4.15-28 and 4.15-29 - NTEC is not proposing to place coal CCBs within the Pinabete Permit Area or proposing any new mine backfill location within the Navajo Mine. CCB placement activities in mine backfill at Navajo Mine ceased in January 2008 and all CCB placement areas have been regarded, topdressed, and seeded according to the existing Navajo Mine SMCRA permit conditions. For clarification, Alternatives B and C should be harmonized with the discussion in Alternative A and recognize that NTEC is no longer receiving CCB material and all mine backfill locations have been reclaimed permit conditions	The text does not imply that CCR will be placed in the mine; however, to ensure clarity, the text has been revised as follows: "Potential impacts from historical mine placement of CCRs (practice ended in 2008) would remain after Navajo Mine closure."
296.205	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	98. Sec 4.15.4.3, Page 4.15-29 - The DEIS text cites "Larger volumes hazardous materials and wastes would be generated during construction of the additional roads." NTEC's management of these materials would not change between Alternative A-D. These generated materials are not consistently discussed.	The following sentence has been added to the Final EIS: "These wastes would be managed as described for Alternative A and in accordance with applicable EPA and Department of Transportation regulations"
296.206	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	100. Sec 4.16.4.3, Page 4.16-13 - As described in Section 3.2.3.1, page 3-23, Alternative C does not include mining through the Pinabete Arroyo and does not require diversion of flows around mining. Please ensure consistency with 3.2.3.1.	Have checked for consistency.
296.207	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	99. Sec 4.16.4.1, and 4.16.4.5, Page 4.16-11 and 4.16-13-14 - Please replace reference BNCC, 2012j with BNCC, 2012g.	Change made
296.208	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	101. Sec 4.17.1.1 - Page 4.17-2 - The reference to HAPs regulation is Section 112 of the CAA (Title I – Air Pollution Prevention Control) rather than Title III.	Change made.
296.209	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo	6/30/2014	102. Sec 4.17.4.1, Page 4.17-21 - The DEIS describes OSMRE's conservative Health Risk Assessment (HRA) for Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM). Please clarify that the nearest resident to the Area IV SMCRA permit boundary is approximately 0.5 mile (approximately 804 meters) and approximately 0.9 mile (approximately 1,448 m) to the proposed mining operations.	Clarified.
297.001	Mr.	Kent	Applegate	MMCo		No Comment relevant to EIS	Comment Noted.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
298.001	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Based on the information presented in this DEIS, the Nation supports OSM's conclusion that Alternative A is the preferred alternative.	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.
298.002	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	The Nation has been a Cooperating Agency throughout the EIS process and expects to continue to work closely with OSM and the consultants in producing the final EIS to insure that all the information presented is accurate.	The suggested change to the footnote has been made.
298.003	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Many people within the Nation who read this document had difficulty locating the explanation of the acronyms. Perhaps putting the acronyms in the glossary would be a more logical location than the Table of Comments.	Thank you for your comment.
298.004	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>Throughout the document, the DEIS discusses the baseline in the document, but seems to be inconsistent in its application without explanation when the baseline varies from the established definition, which appears on page 4-1. The DEIS enumerates the completed federal actions that comprise the environmental baseline. Specifically, the sentence states "These completed federal actions form part of the environmental baseline to which the effects of continuing operations and the Proposed Actions are compared." However, this statement is inaccurate. Throughout the document, there are numerous instances where data was used from a different period of time. Some instances were noted, for example, in the following locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.1.2.5, page 4.1-44: The ozone baseline uses 2005 emissions</li> <li>• Table 4.1-46, page 4.1-93: Projected numbers for MDN deposition rates are compared with numbers from prior to the 12/30/2013 shutdown of units 1-3.</li> <li>• Table 4.1-47, page 4.1-95: Projected numbers for AMoN concentrations are compared with numbers from prior to the 12/30/2013 shutdown of units 1-3.</li> <li>• Section 4.1.4.1, page 4.1-97: Reductions in NOx and PM are from historic levels, not current levels.</li> <li>• Section 4.1.4.5, page 4.1-104: Table 4.1-51 emissions are based on the "2005-2011 baseline period (Units 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5)."</li> </ul> <p>Although due to the recent shut down of units 1-3, utilizing historic data prior to 2014 is unavoidable, notation of this should be made throughout the document as well. It should also be noted in the explanation of the baseline that data for the baseline of three units shut down are unavailable.</p>	<p>See Master Response #14, Baseline.</p> <p>The baseline consists of historic operations prior to 2014 (Units 1-5 operating), and the transitional period during which BART is implemented. The discussion of setting makes this distinction clearly, with chapter headings. The comment cites locations and data within the document that the commenter feels are inaccurate; however, the data in those locations is correct as the baseline has been established. Table 4.1-51, evaluates the No Action Alternative. The No Action Alternative contemplates shutdown of FCPP in 2015. The Action Alternatives, which evaluate to 2041, use Units 4 and 5 as the baseline. However, the No Action Alternative timing would only include a portion of the implementation of FIP for BART (for example, SCR would not be installed under No Action). Therefore, the analysis used a conservative approach to evaluate changes relative to baseline. A footnote has been added to the table to explain this.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
298.005	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Throughout the document, CAA 821 is mentioned. However, this is not accurate, as it has never been codified. FCPP is nevertheless subject to greenhouse gas reporting requirements pursuant to 40 CFR Part 98. It is recommended that throughout the DEIS, wherever CAA 821 is listed as the source of the requirement for FCPP to monitor or regulate GHG emissions, that reference should be substituted with the GHG Reporting Rule, 40 CFR Part 98.	The suggested change was made throughout. Wherever CAA 821 is listed as the source of the requirement for FCPP to monitor or regulate GHG emissions, the reference was changed to the GHG Reporting Rule, 40 CFR Part 98.
298.006	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	On May 12, 2014 US EPA proposed the approval of the New Mexico Regional Haze State Implementation Plan (SIP) for the San Juan Generating Station (SJGS). SJGS is just a few miles from FCPP and is also part of the San Juan Air Basin. Pursuant to the SIP, SJGS would install Selective Non-Catalytic Reduction (SNCR) controls on Units 1 and 4 by the later of within 15 months after US EPA final approval or January 31, 2016 and retire Units 2 and 3 by December 31, 2017. There will also be reductions of SO <sub>2</sub> emissions from Units 1 and 4. The expected reductions in emissions from installation of SNCRs and unit closures are: NO <sub>x</sub> 62%, SO <sub>2</sub> 67%, PM by 50%, CO 44%, GHG 50%, VOC 50%, and Mercury 50%. Since FCPP and SJGS are the two major sources of emissions in San Juan Air Basin, the recent federal and state Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART) requirements for the Regional Haze Rule and other recent rulemakings like the Mercury and Air Toxics (MATS) regulations will contribute significantly to improve the air quality of the Four Corners region and result in significant improvement in visibility in the surrounding Class I areas.	The cumulative impact analysis has been updated to reflect the information provided for the San Juan Generating Station. The description of the San Juan Generating Station in Table 4.18-1 has been amended as follows: San Juan Generating Station is operated by PNM and consists of four coal-fired, pressurized units that generate about 1,800 gross megawatts of electricity. San Juan Generating Station went online in 1973. It is the seventh-largest coal-fired generating station in the West, and is PNM's primary generation source, serving 58 percent of the power needs of PNM customers. The regional haze provision of the Clean Air Act requires the San Juan Generating Station to reduce NO <sub>x</sub> emissions by September 2016 through the installation of Best Available Retrofit Technology, or BART. The New Mexico Regional Haze State Implementation Plan (SIP), which was approved by EPA in May 2014, requires SJGS to install Selective Non-Catalytic Reduction (SNCR) controls on SJGS Units 1 and 4 by Final EPA approval or January 31, 2016, and shut down the remaining Units 2 and 3 in 2017. These measures are expected to significantly reduce NO <sub>x</sub> (62%), SO <sub>2</sub> (67%), PM (50%), CO (44%), GHG (50%), VOC (50%), and Mercury (50%).  Table 4.18-1 provides description of facilities actively or planning to reduce emissions. This table provides project-level descriptions and not a regional perspective; however, collectively, the projects implementing emissions reductions capture the initiative to improve regional haze and air quality.
298.007	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	The last paragraph on page ii should be modified as follows:  APS operates all of FCPP as the operating agent for all the co-owners and owns 63 percent of the total plant capacity. A Lease Agreement between the Navajo Nation and APS, Public Service Company of New Mexico (PNM), El Paso Electric (EPE) Company, Salt River Project, Tucson Electric Company, and Southern California Edison was signed in 1960 and indentured the lease of Navajo Nation Trust Lands for the purpose of constructing and operating the FCPP. <del>In accordance with the FCPP lease, the Navajo Nation does not apply tribal regulation to the FCPP lease area.</del> The Lease Agreement also authorized associated rights-of-way for ancillary facilities (i.e. transmission lines, water pipelines, access roads) on Navajo tribal trust lands. The 1960 Agreement was amended in 1966 to allow the construction of Units 4 and 5 and in 1985 to encompass additional lands for mining operations. APS recently executed a third lease amendment (Lease Amendment No. 3) with the	See Master Response #11, Covenant 17. The Executive Summary has been updated to be consistent with edits to Section 1 as referenced in Master Response #11.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						Navajo Nation to extend the term of the lease for the FCPP an additional 25 years, to 2041, but this action is subject to US Department of Interior Secretarial approval and evaluated in this EIS. <u>Pursuant to the third lease amendment, the Navajo Nation does not intend to regulate the FCPP lease area.</u>	
298.008	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Table ES-2 at page vi, Federal and Tribal Authorities and Actions. The references in the table to EPA’s authority should also include reference to Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 402, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), and Safe Drinking Water Act permits. Table ES-2 is similar to Table 1.1 on page 1-9, and should be changed to be consistent with this recommendation.	The focus of this summary are those federal actions that would rely on this EIS for NEPA compliance.
298.009	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Table ES-11, at pages xxi-xxiii, Applicant Proposed Measures, Best Management Practices, and Standard Operating Procedures Applicable to All Alternatives.  Under the heading Air Quality, page xxi:  • Navajo Mine column – Fugitive dust control measures. It is not only dust that is a concern, the public will be interested to include: coal dust, blasting, ground vibrations [potential impact to Bisti], mining heavy equipment machines  • FCPP column – should include reportable emissions from ancillary infrastructures.	The Navajo Mine fugitive dust measures are expanded upon in Air Quality discussions throughout the document. Sources of fugitive dust are inclusive of the activities listed in the comment; for example, see Table 4.1-7. Ground vibration is handled in the “Noise and Vibration” section. While the Executive Summary table lacks the requested detail, the detail is provided throughout the document.
298.010	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Under the heading Water Quality/Hydrology, page xxi:  • Navajo Mine should include the stormwater pollution prevention plan to meet CWA Section 402.  • Transmission Lines – include crossing of US and Navajo Nation waters to meet CWA Section 401 permitting.	These are addressed in their respective resource categories.
298.011	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Hazardous and Solid wastes, page xxiii:  • The specific measures attributable to the Navajo Mine should also be included for FCPP and the transmission lines.	Not all of the mine related measures are applicable to the FCPP and transmission lines.
298.012	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Introduction  On page 1-2, the last paragraph should be modified as follows:  APS operates all of FCPP as the operating agent for all the co-owners and owns 63 percent of the total plant capacity. A Lease Agreement between the Navajo Nation and APS, Public Service Company of New Mexico (PNM), El Paso Electric (EPE) Company, Salt River Project, Tucson Electric Company, and Southern California Edison was signed in 1960 and indentured the lease of Navajo Nation Trust Lands for the purpose of constructing and operating the FCPP. <del>In accordance with the</del>	Last sentence has been replaced with: “The Navajo Nation has stated that the Tribe has never conceded that Covenant 17 in the original 1960 lease, and Covenant 22 in the amended 1966 lease, prevented the application of tribal regulation on the FCPP lease area; however, the Navajo Nation does not intend to regulate the FCPP lease area due to its interpretation of the stipulations provided in FCPP Lease Amendment No. 3 (2011). APS contends that Covenant 17 allows for the operation of FCPP without compliance with Navajo Nation environmental standards.”

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						FCPP lease, the Navajo Nation does not apply tribal regulation to the FCPP lease area. The Lease Agreement also authorized associated rights-of-way for ancillary facilities (i.e. transmission lines, water pipelines, access roads) on Navajo tribal trust lands. The 1960 Agreement was amended in 1966 to allow the construction of Units 4 and 5 and in 1985 to encompass additional lands for mining operations. The lease was amended in 1966 to add on Units 4 and 5; 1978 to expand the lease for additional ash disposal areas; 1985 to expand mining operations; and 2011 to allow for SCE to sell its interest to APS. Also in 2011, APS executed a lease amendment (Lease Amendment No. 3) with the Navajo Nation to extend the term of the lease for the FCPP an additional 25 years, to 2041. This lease amendment is subject to Secretarial approval and evaluated in this EIS. Pursuant to the third lease amendment, the Navajo Nation does not intend to regulate the FCPP lease area.	
298.013	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	1.4.2.6 The Navajo Nation Although there is a covenant not to regulate FCPP, Navajo Nation Environmental Protection Agency (NNEPA) should be included as they are responsible for inspection of: CWA Section 401; seeking permits for Air Quality Operating Permit Program; hazardous materials and storage, including chemicals; Safe Drinking Water Act, and petroleum storage greater than 100 gallons.	Thank you for your comment. The Navajo Nation is a cooperating agency. NNEPA is listed in the applicable regulatory agency with regard to CWA Section 401, SDWA, and Air Quality Operating Permit Program in the applicable sections of the EIS. Please also see Master Response #11.
298.014	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	3.2.6.13 Visual Resources Aesthetic impacts from the fly ash wind debris and from the smokestacks should be included and thoroughly discussed in the Four Corners Power Plant section.	The wind debris includes other sediment besides flyash, and as such is part of the background condition. The smokestacks are discussed in visual resources.
298.015	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	3.2.6.14 Noise and Vibration Potential impact to ground vibration should be included and discussed thoroughly here since the Navajo Mine is close to the Bisti Wilderness Park.	These issues are addressed in their respective resource categories. The Bisti Wilderness is outside the area affected by these impacts.
298.016	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	3.2.6.15 Hazardous and Solid Wastes The DEIS does not include a hazardous waste management plan for FCPP.	The section addresses the regulatory framework under which the FCPP operates. Discussion of the FCPP Hazardous Waste Management Plan is located on page 4.15-10 of the draft EIS.
298.017	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	3.4 Summary of Impacts and Identification of Preferred Alternative Based on the information presented in this DEIS, the Nation supports OSM's conclusion that Alternative A is the preferred alternative.	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.
298.018	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	It appears that Section 4 was written before the 12/30/13 shutdown of units 1-3, and that the effects of that action were only partially incorporated into the analysis. A casual reader is likely to be misled and may believe that reductions in environmental impacts that are discussed in the EIS would result from the proposed project, when in fact those	See Master Response 14, Baseline.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						reductions resulted from a separate compliance action that already has been completed. Some examples are noted below, but the entire section should be carefully read and edited with this issue in mind.	
298.019	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	On page 4.1-1, the EIS references VOCs as “criteria emissions.” Reactive or volatile organic compounds (ROCs and VOCs) are not criteria pollutants under the CAA. The reference to ROCs and VOCs as “criteria emissions” should be struck from the text above. If “criteria emissions” means something other than a criteria pollutant designated under the CAA, that term should be defined. Otherwise, any other place in this DEIS that refers to VOCs as a criteria pollutant or lists them under “criteria emissions” should be deleted, including the references found in 4.1.1.5 and 4.1.2.3. Any table that lists VOCs as a “criteria emissions” should also be edited, including Table 4.1-6, Table 4.1-7, Table 4.1-39 and Table 4.1-40.	The main distinction between “criteria pollutants” and “criteria emissions” is that the criteria pollutant ozone is not directly emitted, rather, its precursors NOX and VOC are the criteria emittents (regulated pollutants) which react with sunlight to form ground-level photochemical ozone, as identified in the last sentence.  For better clarity, the paragraph was revised to read as follows:  The Navajo Mine and FCPP are located on Navajo sovereign tribal land; therefore, air emissions and air quality are under the jurisdiction of the Navajo Nation Environmental Protection Agency (NNEPA) and overseen by the EPA Region IX in San Francisco. Federal and tribal law defines criteria pollutants to include ozone (O3), nitrogen dioxide (NO2), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO2), respirable particulate matter (PM10), fine particulate matter (PM2.5), and lead (Pb). Elimination of tetraethyl lead in motor gasoline has eliminated emissions of lead from vehicles and portable equipment, although tetraethyl lead is still used in some types of aviation gasoline. Ozone is not directly emitted, rather, its precursors NOX and VOC are the pollutants which react with sunlight to form ground-level photochemical ozone and contribute to regional haze, along with SO2 and particulate matter. Criteria emissions – also referred to as regulated pollutants – caused by the Action include reactive or volatile organic compounds (ROCs or VOCs), nitrogen oxides (NOX as NO and NO2), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO2), respirable particulate matter (PM10), and fine particulate matter (PM2.5).
298.020	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	The first footnote on page 4.1-1 discusses the Voluntary Compliance Agreement (VCA). The text of this footnote is inaccurate. The Nation recommends the text of the first footnote state the following: In 2005, the Nation and owners of the FCPP entered into a VCA under which FCPP agreed to apply for and obtain a CAA Title V operating permit from NNEPA provided, among other things, that permit requirements would be no more stringent than federal requirements unless FCPP agreed to more stringent requirements and the administration and enforcement of the permit would be no more stringent than what EPA would do and that would be required under federal court decisions.	The requested modification will be made. See also Master Response #11, Covenant 17
298.021	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Relationship to NAAQS  On page 4.1-10, the statement regarding the primary NAAQS for PM2.5 as “requisite to protect the public welfare” is incorrect. In actuality, primary NAAQS standards are established to protect the public health, in accordance with CAA Section 109A. They are not established to protect the public welfare. It is secondary NAAQS standards that are established to protect the public welfare, in accordance with CAA Section 109B.	The change was made, as suggested. The words “primary and” were deleted in front of the word “secondary” in the referenced sentence.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
298.022	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	On page 4.1-12, there is discussion about the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule. The final EIS should reflect the fact that the Supreme Court reversed the DC Circuit Court of Appeals in EPA v. EME Homer City Generation, 134 S. Ct. 1584 (2014), upholding EPA's Cross-State Air Pollution Rule.	The suggested text was added to the end of the first bullet at the top of the referenced page, to bring the status of the described court case up to date.
298.023	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Also on page 4.1-12, in the last paragraph of this subsection, the Mercury Air and Toxics standards are discussed. The final EIS should reflect the fact that the Court of Appeals upheld the Mercury and Air Toxics Standards in White Stallion Energy Center v. EPA, No. 12-1100, 748 F.3d 1222 (D.C. Cir. 2014).  The potential implications of these recent court cases should also be addressed.	The suggested text was added to the referenced paragraph, to bring the status of the described court case up to date.
298.024	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Acid Rain Program  On page 4.1-13, regarding acid rain, the acid rain program is a federal program, and its requirements cannot be made more stringent by states or tribes. FCPP agreed to have NNEPA administer the acid rain program. The program is also administered by U.S. EPA, not just EPA Region IX. The Nation suggests that the first sentence of the paragraph should state: "FCPP is subject to the Acid Rain Program, as administered by NNEPA and U.S. EPA."	The first sentence of the last paragraph in section 4.1.1.4 was changed to the sentence provided in the comment to reflect the larger regulatory authority of EPA.
298.025	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	4.1.1.5: Federal Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) Program  On page 4.1-13 in the second to last paragraph, the text references a "recent DC Circuit Court decision on PSD rules related to PM2.5 increments and baselines could affect FCPP in the future." The case the text is referencing is Sierra Club v. EPA, 2014 WL 2619824 (D.C. Cir. 2014). The final EIS should reflect any updates concerning the PSD PM2.5 rules and potential implications.	To bring the referenced text up to date, the following was added: "On November 26, 2013 the EPA issued a good cause final rule to remove elements of the Clean Air Act Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) program for fine particle pollution. These elements address air quality modeling and monitoring provisions for fine particle pollution in areas protected by the PSD program."
298.026	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	4.1.1.6: Federal Stationary Source Regulations  Much of the air quality discussion is confusing due to use of the terms "historic baseline" and "pre-2014 baseline," using numbers prior to 2014, and discussing emission reductions post-2014 in relation to this pre-2014 baseline. This gives the impression that the actions upon which this DEIS are based will result in a reduction of emissions, when in fact the emissions may remain essentially the same in comparison to the 2014 baseline. E.g., Tables 4.1-31, 4.1-32. The FEIS should compare baseline (current) to projected (future) emissions.	The citations in this comment are consistent with how we describe the baseline in the EIS: First provide emissions that occurred prior to the FIP for BART (Units 1-5), and then in the next subsection describe the emission reductions that occur as a result of implementing BART (shut down Units 1-3 in December 2013, install SCR by 2017). Where the text quantifies the emission reductions due to the implementation of BART, it is clear that the reduction is part of baseline, not as a result of the Proposed Action. In addition, please see Master Response 14, Baseline.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
298.027	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>Title V Operating Permits</p> <p>On page 4.1-15, enforceable limits are listed for the current Part 71 permit for FCPP, which expired August 1, 2013. The permit mentioned is expired but FCPP submitted a timely permit renewal application on January 25, 2013. FCPP may operate according to their present permit terms and conditions until NNEPA either issues them a new permit or denies their renewal application.</p>	The text was changed to include the information provided in the comment regarding the operating authority under the expired Title V permit.
298.028	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>Continuous Emissions Monitoring</p> <p>Page 4.1-15 discusses requirements of Sections 412 and 821 of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 7401-7671, et seq. Pursuant to the section in this document called "General Comments," please change Section 821 to 40 CFR Part 98.</p>	The suggested change has been made throughout the EIS.
298.029	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>4.1.2.5 Visibility/Regional Haze</p> <p>Page 4.1-45, the first two full paragraphs discuss using 2005 data as the baseline data. It is not clear if the 2018 base case took into account the fact that three of the units operating in 2005 would not be in operation in 2018. Clarification of how the "base cases" for 2005 and 2018 were determined would be helpful. If the model was run with that information, please provide an explanation as to why the emissions did not change when the number of units in operation decreased.</p>	The text was changed to clarify that both the 2005 and 2018 data points include operation of Units 1, 2, and 3. The text was also changed to clarify the point that the regional analysis is not significantly affected by inclusion of the operation of the units and to include a reference to tables in Section 4.18 that show a regional perspective. The new text reads: "The comparison between 2005 baseline and projected 2018 emissions are a comparison of Four Corners Regional air quality, where the operation of Units 1, 2, and 3 are included in the analysis. The comparison is valid in a regional context, as the shutdown of Units 1, 2, and 3 in beginning in 2014 do not result in substantial changes the regional modeling projection. Tables 4.18-2 and 4.18-3 show the percentage changes in SO2 and NOx emissions for 17 regional electric power producers in geographic New Mexico, Arizona, and Colorado. Regional emissions reductions also include FIP compliance at other power plants." See Master Response 14, Baseline.
298.030	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>Table 4.1-36 on page 4.1-77 should edited to reflect the fact that there are only six (6) criteria pollutants: NOx, SOx, PM, CO, ozone and lead.</p>	The table title was changed to 'PSD Emission Significance Thresholds' to be inclusive of all compounds listed in the table. The left column heading is also changed to 'PSD Pollutants.'
298.031	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>On page 4.1-80, the EIS states that "A train transports coal from Lowe Stockpile to the processing area where the railcars are unloaded into one of two hoppers, displacing air upward, which entrains some coal dust." There is no reference to these PM emissions in the PM tables. Tables 4.1-7 and 4.1-40 reference PM from loading the railcars but not from unloading them. Table 4.1-6 includes this note: "PM10 and PM2.5 for exhaust only, fugitive dust accounted for in BNCC FONSI." If this refers to dust from railcar unloading, it is not included in this DEIS, although it is referenced on page 4.1-80. Although it may be a minor contribution to PM emissions, on page 4.17-19, PM10 is noted as the "air pollutant of primary public health concern associated with the Proposed Action at the Navajo Mine," so emission numbers should be all-inclusive.</p>	Both tables (4.1-7 and 4.1-40) include a row titled "Unloading at Stockpiles and Railcar Loading." The unloading operation is included in the tables and the analysis.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
298.032	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	On page 4.1-81, several sentences relating to plume contrast and plume perceptibility are repeated.	Thank you for your comment. We have adjusted the text accordingly.
298.033	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	4.1.4.1 Alternative A – Proposed Action On page 4.1-93, at Table 4.1-47, Projected Normalized MDN Deposition Rates for Region. The projected numbers for MDN deposition rates are compared with numbers from prior to the 12/30/2013 shutdown of units 1, 2 and 3. This should be clearly indicated. If there is a way to provide the current data from the last six months of operation with only two units as compared to the projected range, this would be helpful.	More recent MDN data would not be available, as data are not released until the whole year is released. Because MDN data are regional in nature, changes due to the shutdown of Units 1, 2, and 3 would barely be detectable at the closest MDN detection point (Mesa Verde). Also, please see Master Response 14, Baseline.
298.034	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Likewise, on page 4.1-95, at Table 4.1-47, the projected numbers for AMoN concentrations are compared with numbers from prior to the three unit shut down.	AMON data would not be available, as data are not released until the whole year is released. Also, please see Master Response 14, Baseline.
298.035	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	The Nation reiterates that the closure of three units, Units 1, 2 and 3, the older, less efficient units on the plant, will significantly reduce carbon emissions. From 2013 to 2014, the FCPP will see a significant drop in emissions from all pollutants to include CO2. Throughout this section, older IPCC reports are cited. However, a Fifth Assessment Report was released in 2013. It is recommended that the statements in this section that are based on information from older IPCC reports be revised or supplemented to reflect updated information in the Fifth Assessment Report. Page 4.2-1, the third paragraph should be modified as: In its Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990–2012 (EPA 2012b), the EPA provides summary information on <u>greenhouse gas emissions by sources and removals by sinks</u> <del>the work of in accordance with commitments under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (2009) and the IPCC (1990–2007)</del> ; key information from that report is summarized below. On page 4.2-1, the definition for climate change is contained the in UNFCCC, Article 1, (available at: <a href="http://unfccc.int/files/essential_background/background_publications_htmlpdf/application/pdf/conveng.pdf">http://unfccc.int/files/essential_background/background_publications_htmlpdf/application/pdf/conveng.pdf</a> ) but the source listed as the reference to this definition is the UNFCCC glossary ( <a href="http://unfccc.int/essential_background/glossary/items/3666.php">http://unfccc.int/essential_background/glossary/items/3666.php</a> ), which does not contain this term. The source should be updated in the DEIS list of references in Section 8.	The Fifth IPCC Assessment Report has been reviewed and incorporated into Section 4.2 of the EIS as appropriate; however, after careful review of the Fifth IPCC report, it was concluded that the report reinforces the conclusion from the previous IPCC reports. The latest IPCC report does not change the analysis or conclusions presented in the Draft EIS. The page 4.2-1 text was changed as suggested. Regarding the definition for climate change, the following definition was included in the EIS:” ‘Climate change’ means a change of climate which is attributed directly or indirectly to human activity that alters the composition of the global atmosphere and which is in addition to natural climate variability observed over comparable time periods.” (United Nations 1992.)
298.036	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	4.2.1.1 Federal Regulations It is recommended that this subsection reference EPA’s proposed carbon pollution rule, which carries implications for the regulation of GHG emissions from FCPP.	Suggested edits have been made

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
298.037	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	On page 4.2-2, the following sentence should be changed as noted to be consistent with GHG Mandatory Reporting Rule. See 74 Fed. Reg. 56260, 56285 (Oct. 30, 2009). "Mandatory Reporting of Greenhouse Gases Rule: The rule requires specified industrial source categories and facilities with an aggregated heat input <u>capacity</u> of 30 mmBTU or more per hour or that emit 25,000 metric tons or more per year (MT/yr) of <u>CO2</u> equivalent (CO2e) GHG emissions to submit annual reports to the EPA.	Suggested edits have been made
298.038	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	4.2.1.2 State Rules Executive Order 2009-047 Page 4.2-3: This Executive Order is dated December 4, 2009, not the 7th. It appears that New Mexico is no longer involved in the Western Climate Initiative, although this is not made clear in the document.	Thank you for your comment.
298.039	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	New Mexico Environment Department Title V GHG Reporting Requirements In the last paragraph at the bottom of page 4.2-3, the first sentence should be modified to read: <del>For Title V sources that are not oil and gas facilities, the existing rule requires CO2 and CH4 emissions to be quantified and reported in accordance with 40 CFR Part 98. In accordance with NMED GHG reporting and quantification procedures, Title V sources that are not oil and gas facilities shall quantify and report CO2 and CH4 emissions using EPA GHG reports; EPA methods applied to facilities not subject to EPA reporting; NMED procedures; or Best Available Data only for sources lacking quantification methods under EPA methods or NMED procedures.</del>	The suggested change to the text was made.
298.040	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	4.2.2.3 Emission Sources On page 4.2-6, an outdated inventory was cited. The current inventory, as published by USEPA, shows that electric power accounts for 32% of GHG emissions, transportation is 28%, industry is 20%, commercial and residential make up 10%, and agriculture makes up 10% of GHG emissions. The current inventory is found at <a href="http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/ghgemissions/usinventoryreport.html">http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/ghgemissions/usinventoryreport.html</a> .	Data from 2012 were used in the Draft EIS. The new values were added to the Final EIS, but they are similar to the 2012 data and do not change the analysis or conclusions.
298.041	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	4.2.2.4 Emission Trends On page 4.2-7, the GHG emissions increase in the US is inaccurate. They have not increased 10%, but 4.7%. <a href="http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/Downloads/ghgemissions/US-GHG-Inventory-2014-Main-Text.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/Downloads/ghgemissions/US-GHG-Inventory-2014-Main-Text.pdf</a> . Emissions decreased by 3.4 percent from 2011 to 2012 due to a decrease in the carbon intensity of fuels consumed by power producers to generate electricity. Id.	Data from 2012 were used in the Draft EIS. The new values were added to the Final EIS, but they are similar to the 2012 data and do not change the analysis or conclusions.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
298.042	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>4.2.2.5 Electric Power Generation</p> <p>This section also contains outdated data. Please review the updated Inventory found at <a href="http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/Downloads/ghgemissions/US-GHG-Inventory-2014-Main-Text.pdf">http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/Downloads/ghgemissions/US-GHG-Inventory-2014-Main-Text.pdf</a>, which will show reduced emissions from coal sources. 40% of the CO2 emissions come from fossil fuel combustion in electric generation as opposed to the cited 81%.</p>	Data from 2012 were used in the Draft EIS. The new values were added to the Final EIS, but they are similar to the 2012 data and do not change the analysis or conclusions.
298.043	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>4.2.4 Environmental Consequences</p> <p>Page 4.2-16: The proper citations are 40 CFR Part 98, Subpart D and 40 CFR Part 75.</p>	Suggested edits have been made
298.044	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>4.2.4.1 Alternative A</p> <p>This section should include information pertaining to EPA's proposed rule regulating GHG emissions from existing power plants, discussed above.</p>	In June 2014, EPA issued the "Clean Power Plan" proposal to cut carbon pollution from existing power plants. The proposal establishes state-by-state goals to reduce greenhouse gases by 2030. The focus is on power plants, but states have discretion to meet goals with a combination of industries. The proposed regulation is subject to comment and finalization. Additionally, tribal lands are not given goals at this time. A proposed timetable is suggested for moving into the process with tribes, with July 2017 being when EPA would have a proposed goal for tribal lands. States are given a year to establish programs, with a provision for a 2-year extension; therefore, 2020 is when states are required to have a program in place. The tribes will likely lag that by a year or two, with the compliance timeframe lagging also. The EIS was changed to acknowledge the proposed plan; however, because of the uncertainties with whether the plan will be adopted or modified, or how it would be implemented on the Navajo Nation, there is no change to the conclusions or analysis in the EIS.
298.045	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>4.3 Earth Resources</p> <p>4.3.2.4 Paleontological Resources</p> <p>Navajo Nation Minerals Department has the authority to issue Geological and Paleontological Reconnaissance Permits and Paleontological Collection Permits. Because of that authority, Minerals reviewed the Paleontological Resource Management Plan (the Plan) for the Navajo Mine, made comments, and their comments were included in that Plan. Although the Plan was not formally approved, Minerals determined that the Plan presents the appropriate measures to follow for mitigation. The Plan exceeds Navajo Nation requirements for such a plan. The Plan is consistent with the federal Paleontological Resources Preservation Act of 2009. That law does not apply to Indian land, but Minerals agreed, in the spirit of cooperation, to use the Act as a guide in developing the Plan.</p> <p>Therefore, the mitigation offered in 4.3.5, to have a paleontologist available to monitor during activities, is not necessary due to compliance with the Plan.</p>	The EIS has been revised to more clearly state the following: (1) The Navajo Nation retains ownership of all paleontological resources. (2) Through the permit and implementation of the Paleontological Resources Management Plan, OSMRE requires the proponent to include in the Permit Application Package the process for managing paleontological resources. (3) If a permit is approved, the way in which paleontological resources are managed is decided by the Navajo Nation, and OSMRE oversees the process.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
298.046	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>4.4 Cultural Resources</p> <p>The Nation strongly urges OSM to continue and increase the levels of consultation regarding cultural resources. As a reminder, work needs to be authorized by Navajo Nation Historic Preservation Department (HPD) prior to commencing any work or claiming that an area has clearance. Also, mitigation needs to be discussed with HPD prior to deciding the final form of mitigation. HPD looks forward to continuing consultation with OSM on these issues, and looks forward to hearing from OSM and the consultants early and often.</p>	Thank you for the comment. A complete description of all consultation conducted as part of the Section 106 process is included in Chapter 5 of the Draft EIS. This consultation was completed and two Programmatic Agreements drafted and signed prior to publication of the Final EIS.
298.047	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	On page 4.4-5 and 4.4-6 at Table 4.4.1, please delete the reference that Navajo has been here from 1450 to present. Navajo culture asserts existence in the area from time immemorial, and specifying this date is inconsistent.	Suggested edits have been made
298.048	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	On page 4.4-6, and anywhere else this reference occurs, please delete the reference that the Anasazi are "Ancestral Puebloan". This is also inconsistent with Navajo belief, based on an inaccurate assessment of language, and is an outdated theory.	Suggested edits have been made
298.049	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	On page 4.4-17, there is a typo under the subsection entitled "Navajo Mine." In the paragraph that starts "In 2006," the following words should be "the Navajo Nation Archaeological Department," not the "Navajo National. . ."	Suggested edits have been made
298.050	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>4.5 Water Resources/Hydrology</p> <p>Page 4.5-1, third paragraph. It is unclear how OSM determined the Region of Influence (ROI) for deposition to be only 20 miles to the northeast of FCPP (as compared to 30 miles to the northwest and southeast) when the prevailing winds are from the southwest.</p>	The EIS was edited so that text in Section 4.5 matches the description in Section 4.1 to state the deposition area is less than 50 km. With regard to the direction of areas within the deposition area, the Ecological Risk Assessment used the CalPUFF model to determine where areas where the concentration of constituents was greater than background concentrations.
298.051	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Page 4.5-1, second paragraph. The construction of the transmission lines may involve the grading, clearing or grubbing for access roads or pads. The new disturbance of more 1.0 acre of land surface will require coverage under the NPDES general permit for storm water discharges associated with construction activities (Construction General Permit or CGP). [Also applies to Transmission Lines section on page 4.5-41.]	Added the following language to the paragraph: "NTEC will be required to obtain a construction general permit for extension of transmission lines and construction of new roads associated with the development of the Pinabete permit area." The subject transmission lines included as connected actions do not involve any new construction or land disturbance. Therefore, a construction general permit is not applicable to the operation and maintenance of these structures.
298.052	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Page 4.5-2: Table 4.5-1 lists NPDES permit effluent limitation parameters for all the outfalls at FCPP (permit no. NM0000019). This table should include the monitoring frequency for each parameter for each outfall. A table listing all the permit effluent limitation parameters for all the outfalls at Navajo Mine should be included as well (permit no. NN0028193).	A new table has been added providing discharge limits applicable to Navajo Mine. Information regarding monitoring frequency would not affect any of the analysis or conclusions and is not presented.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
298.053	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Page 4.5-2 contains the statement “A review of EPA records also verified that BNCC and APS have no recorded NPDES permit violations.” It is not clear which EPA records are referred to, and whether discharge monitoring reports, CEI reports, and analytical data are included. For example, on February 19, 2010, BNCC had an accidental release of water from a sediment pond into a FCPP canal and hot pond which leads into Morgan Lake. The federal Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSMRE) issued a Notice of Proposed Civil Penalty Assessment to BNCC in connection with the incident. This should be verified and corrected in the record.	The cited case was an OSMRE action, that was also provided to the EPA. The EPA did not issue a notice of violation.
298.054	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Other Federal Programs Page 4.5-3. The first paragraph should read as follows: <del>“Prior to MATS and CSAPR, the EPA sought to address interstate deposition related pollution through CWA programs. Specifically Under</del> the CWA, states <u>and tribes with approved programs</u> typically establish water quality standards based on EPA-recommended criteria for surface waters. If a surface water does not meet standards, <u>the CWA</u> generally requires a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) <u>to be established</u> that identifies the maximum amount of pollutant that can enter the water and still meet standards. <del>States are responsible for taking actions to ensure the TMDL is not exceeded.</del> For point sources of pollution, such as an outfall from a sewage treatment plant, CWA permitted discharge limits are to be consistent with the TMDL. However, there is no similar regulatory requirement for nonpoint sources of pollution, such as atmospheric deposition over states, <u>tribal lands, or other regions</u> . States <u>and tribes</u> may take actions, such as providing technical or financial assistance to limit pollution from nonpoint sources <u>through nonpoint source management controls</u> , but legal obstacles arise when atmospheric deposition affecting state waters originates in emissions from another state (GAO 2013).”	Suggested edits have been made
298.055	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Page 4.5-3. This section should address whether any Notices of Proposed Civil Penalty Assessment or other similar type notices have been issued by OSM for BNCC operations at Navajo Mine for water related incidents.	The notice of violation for the release from the sediment pond has been noted.
298.056	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	4.5.1.2 State Regulations Page 4.5-4. This section should be corrected to note segment-specific criteria for temperature, phosphorous, bacteria, and/or conductance have been set for all but one segment of the San Juan River Basin, not just the La Plata and Animas rivers.	The following text has been added to Section 4.5.1.2 State Regulations of the EIS, “Specific water quality standards for temperature, phosphorus, bacteria and conductance have been set for all but one segment of the San Juan River.” This comment does not change the basis for the analysis in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
298.057	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>4.5.1.3 Tribal Standards</p> <p>Page 4.5-4: The first few sentences of this section should be changed to read as follows:</p> <p>“The Navajo Nation has adopted the Navajo Nation Surface Water Quality Standards (NNEPA 2008), which establish various surface water use quality standards and <u>which have been approved by EPA</u>. These standards apply to all surface waters of the Navajo Nation, which include, but are not limited to, ephemeral, intermittent, and perennial streams, springs, wetlands, and any natural or man-made depressions or basins that impound water within the Navajo Nation’s <del>border jurisdiction</del>. However, <del>due to a covenant in the lease between APS and the Navajo Nation (Covenant 17: Operation of Power Plant, 1960 et. seq.)</del>, NNEPA water quality standards do not apply to <u>Morgan Lake, which is the only surface water into which the facilities or operations of the FCPP discharges. The NNWQS do apply to the surface waters into which, only the Navajo Mine discharges.</u>”</p> <p>These changes are made to correctly describe the state of Navajo law and authorities. The Nation has not yet promulgated groundwater quality standards, so adding “surface” in the second sentence notes this fact.</p>	Change made
298.058	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>Page 4.5-4 states that there are no water quality standards for total dissolved solids (TDS), sulfate, or fluoride. Despite this statement and the lack of such standards in the Navajo Nation Surface Water Quality Standards (NNSWQS), Table 4.5-2 contains livestock watering standards for fluoride, sulfate and TDS. It is not clear how OSM arrived at the standards presented in the table.</p>	Table 4.5-2 in the DEIS is now Table 4.5-3. Standards for TDS, sulfate and fluoride have been removed from this table. However, the text of the document still references benchmark values for TDS, sulfate and fluoride as these are relevant standards useful for comparison to the data. The text includes reference to the source for these benchmark values and is clear that these are not enforceable standards.
298.059	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>Page 4.5-5 discusses the draft 2013 Surface Water Standards, and mentions “2010 standards.” To clarify, on March 28, 2009, US EPA approved the most recent water quality standards amendments, which were submitted to USEPA in December 2008. These are the most recent amendments that were approved by both USEPA and Navajo Nation Council.</p>	Revised accordingly
298.060	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>The Deposition Area ERA (4.5-14, 1-6) model evaluation describes some of the metals and contributors of the potential impacts to described areas but not to the major recharge areas discussed above, although no map of the Deposition ERA model was located in this EIS.</p>	Thank you for your comment. A map of the Deposition area has been added to Section 4.5 of the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
298.061	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	On Figure 4.5-1, at page 4.5-7, Water Wells and Springs, there are actual well identification numbers associated with the wells on the maps. Each should also have a GPS point of each water well and spring. The well identification number should be an actual Tribal Well Identification Number that is associated with that Grazing District, namely Land Management District 13 for the Navajo Nation. The tribal well identification number is given to all permitted wells drilled on the Navajo Nation by the Navajo Nation Water Code Administration. The wells and the associated identification number should be listed for well construction and aquifer reference.	The appropriate Well Identification numbers have been added to the wells depicted on figure 4.5-1
298.062	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Page 4.5-9. With respect to seeps and springs, in the recent past, Navajo EPA has observed and sampled seeps coming out of the east bank of Chaco Wash west of the ash disposal ponds. A large spring or flowing well located at the base of the Hogback across from the mouth of Chinde Wash is not shown on this figure or mentioned in this section (although it is clearly visible on Google Earth). The DEIS should address this water source and it's connectivity to the proposed mining activities.	Information included in the EIS is consistent with CHIA and SMCRA permit applications. The EIS has been revised to state that information regarding additional seeps was provided by Navajo Nation and mentioning seeps near the FCPP in the environmental setting (these seeps were already discussed in the impact analysis).
298.063	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Page 4.5-10. With respect to the final paragraph, for a period of time, APS was unsure of the origin of water present in the alluvial formation. APS was trying to determine if the hydraulic head of the water in the alluvium was from the ash disposal ponds or Morgan Lake further east. The ultimate determination should be noted in this section. The last sentence is incorrect. Table 4.5-4 is unrelated to the FCPP monitoring wells. Table 4.5-6 provides water quality summaries for the groundwater around the FCPP, not physical characteristics of the wells.	In addition to the provided gradient in the EIS calculated from wells 41, 42, and 43, OSM also calculated the gradient between 41, 12R, and 43 which showed groundwater moving southwest from Morgan Lake. These two calculations together show that groundwater moves radially from Morgan Lake. Text in section has been revised. As such, the water chemistry and water quality data provided does not indicate significant contribution of water from the ash ponds as indicated in the comment. A description of water quality beneath the ash ponds has been added to page 4.5-24.
298.064	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	With respect to the last paragraph on page 4.5-14, a supplemental groundwater study program and monitoring well installation includes a list of constituents that are monitored.	Thank you for your comment.
298.065	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Pages 4.5-13 to 4.5-20. This section overall was a bit disorganized and confusing at times. For example, the first paragraph is repeated three paragraphs later, the discussion of coal combustion residue (CCR) placement is just thrown in without a heading or context, and the discussion of the "Alluvium Aquifer" begins five paragraphs before the appropriate sub-heading and introductory paragraph.	Thank you for your comment. The text has been revised accordingly.
298.066	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Page 4.5-14. This section should include a discussion of the impacts to groundwater from CCR placement in the ash ponds near the FCPP.	The EIS section has been revised to acknowledge the Final CCR rule and associated groundwater monitoring requirements.
298.067	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Figure 4.5-3 at page 4.5-15. A much smaller scale figure would aid in the evaluation of the contents of this figure.	The figure includes more components than would be accommodated by the smaller scale, as such no change made.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
298.068	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Page 4.5-17. In the sixth paragraph it is unclear which wells are considered to be "background" and what how that determination was reached.	Wells considered background are those upgradient of the ash disposal areas (MW-43, MW-12R, MW-41, LS-1, LS-2). The text has been updated in the section.
298.069	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Table 4.5-6 Summary of Groundwater Quality Monitoring Results at FCPP APS has wells completed in both the alluvium and the Lewis Shale. They also have wells upgradient and downgradient from the ash ponds. It is unclear which well data are summarized in this table. The time period is covered is also unclear. If "background" wells exist, they should be presented separately like the baseline data for the mine? More information is needed to make this table useful.	Table 4.5-7 has been revised to include three columns (Min, max, average) for water quality results for MW 41, 43, and 12R to provide a comparison to the water quality results shown. The other columns provide the min, max, and average values for all other monitoring wells in the ash disposal area. In addition, text summarizing the water quality data has been added to page 4.5-24.
298.070	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Further, this table contains inaccurate information. The Navajo Nation Primary Drinking Water Regulations are available on the Navajo EPA's website (www.navajopublicwater.org). The following constituents were found in error on the table (SEE COMMENT LETTER 0298 FOR TABLES):	Suggested edits have been made
298.071	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	4.5.2.2 Surface Water (including waters of the US) Page 4.5-21, first paragraph. Please correct the Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC) to reflect that the northern part of the Navajo Mine falls within the Middle San Juan River HUC 14080105.	Suggested edits have been made
298.072	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Page 4.5-21, first paragraph, last sentence. Roads used to maintain the transmission lines can affect the water quality of the many water bodies they cross. The FEIS should discuss them in this section.	This was evaluated based on proximity to waters of the U.S. There will be no new roads and changes to existing access roads as part of the Proposed Action.
298.073	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Page 4.5-21, first paragraph under Regional Surface Water Resources, last sentence. Roads used to maintain the transmission lines can affect the water quality of the many water bodies they cross. The FEIS should discuss them in this section.	This was evaluated based on proximity to waters of the U.S.
298.074	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Page 4.5-21, last paragraph. This section should be updated to reflect the most recent assessment by New Mexico Environment Department (NMED). Also, Navajo Reservoir is not located on the Navajo Nation.	The EIS has been updated with the correct information for San Juan River and the more recent 2014-2016 citation included. The text has been revised accordingly.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
298.075	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Page 4.5-22. The section on NNEPA monitoring is not complete. Several years of data are not mentioned for Bitsui and Chinde Washes. Most of the exceedances for the Chaco, San Juan, Chinde, and Bitsui Washes are not mentioned, suggesting that available data identify no water quality issues when in fact there are possible impairments due to aluminum, lead, arsenic, mercury, gross alpha, selenium, and TSS. In addition to the data used for this section, data for the San Juan River at the Four Corners collected between 2012 and 2013 indicate that other parameters such as beryllium, barium, and chromium may be a concern within the ROI. These results are preliminary, but should be addressed in the FEIS. These data are available from NNEPA upon request.	Figure 4.5-9 has been updated with the more recent monitoring data. The text on page 4.5-22 has been revised as follows: The Chaco River had the longest dataset of record with sampling from 1998 to 2013. Chinde Wash data covered the period 2001, 2003, 2004, 2009-2011, Bitsui Wash only had data for 2001-2003, 2010 and 2011 and data collected in the San Juan River was for the years 2006, 2011-2013.
298.076	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Page 4.5-28. Mention is made of how New Mexico increased its selenium standard to 0.05 mg/L, however the Navajo Nation Acute and Chronic Aquatic and Wildlife Habitat standards are still 0.033 mg/L and 0.002 mg/L, respectively on the San Juan River. Our Agricultural Water Supply standard is also 0.020 mg/L. Navajo Nation standards should be addressed in this section.	The following sentence was added to the paragraph: “The Navajo Nation also has standards for the segments of the San Juan River which flow through tribal lands, as shown on Table 4.5-2.”
298.077	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Page 4.5-31, first paragraph. The NNEPA water quality standard referenced is for “Aquatic and Wildlife Habitat—Chronic.”	Thank you for your comment. The text has been revised accordingly.
298.078	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Page 4.5-31, third paragraph: The USGS data require further examination. The data available to NNEPA does not show any exceedances of the Secondary Human Contact standard for cadmium. On a related note, NNEPA has found lead in excess of the NNEPA water quality standards, but these exceedances were not mentioned.	The data in this paragraph is directly from the OSMRE CHIA. The following sentence has been added to the paragraph: It is important to note however that water quality sampling conducted by NNEPA at various stations along the Chaco River have not indicated any exceedances of NNEPA standards for cadmium, secondary human contact (NNEPA 2013). NNEPA sampling also found exceedance of the lead standard for all designated beneficial uses at all stations in the Chaco River (NNEPA 2013).
298.079	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Page 4.5-31, last paragraph: The source of the data are used for this “similar analysis” is unclear.	The citation for this analysis is OSMRE 2012c
298.080	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Page 4.5-33. APS data from the Morgan Lake blowdown should be presented in this section.	The following sentence was added to the section: Water quality results from a single sample event in 2010 in the Chaco River at the point of Morgan Lake blowdown was available. For this sample event, pH was 8.4, TDS was 723, and all metals and other constituents met NNEPA standards, with the exception of aluminum which was elevated above acute and chronic wildlife habitat at 4mg/L.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
298.081	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Page 4.5-33 to 4.5-34 last paragraph on 33. The source of this data should be included, as well as information regarding the sampling locations in reference to the distance upstream and downstream. Also, the data presented in the figure referenced cover a much longer time period than October 2008-August 2009, and the correct time period should be indicated.	The paragraph has been revised as follows: Water quality data for samples collected in the Chaco River both upstream and downstream of the FCPP discharge location were also available (see Figure 4.5-9). Samples were collected by APS between October 2008 and August 2009 (APS 2013). In addition, the data includes samples collected by NNEPA between 1998 and 2013, although sampling data upstream and downstream of FCPP only extends through 2012 (NNEPA 2013). An independent comparison of the upstream and downstream sample data was conducted and found no statistically significant difference between the sample sets for any of the constituents tested, with the exception of boron and sulfate. The data sets for sulfate, while significantly different between upstream and downstream do not exhibit a systematic pattern of either location having higher concentration than the other. All sample results for boron are well below all beneficial use water quality standards, as shown in Figure 4.5-9; however, the boron concentrations (total and dissolved) are higher downstream of the FCPP than upstream. Variations in data post-2009 are not statistically significant and appear to be similar both upstream and downstream of the facilities.
298.082	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Page 4.5-34, first full paragraph. The DEIS incorrectly treats TDS and sediment loading as correlated, which is not necessarily the case. Morgan Lake is a perfect example of this.	The primary point in the paragraph related to concentrations of elevated aluminum detected in the Chaco River, and their correlation with elevated sediment load. As a secondary observation, the paragraph noted that elevated aluminum also correlated with elevated TDS. Morgan Lake was not mentioned in this paragraph about the Chaco River.
298.083	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Page 4.5-37, Figure 4.5-8. All of the charts seem to be truncated—the text states that the data in this figure are from 2003-2010 (see p. 4.5-33, “Water Quality”, 2nd paragraph). Including graphs with the entire date range would be more helpful.	The figure has been revised to include all data within the range for which the constituents were detected.
298.084	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Page 4.5-40, Figure 4.5-9. The figure should be clarified to further identify particulates addressed. It is not clear if “SO” refers to SO <sub>2</sub> or SO <sub>3</sub> , or all oxides of sulfur. The reference to “NO” without further qualification is similarly problematic.	The figure has been revised to state “SO <sub>4</sub> ” and “NO <sub>3</sub> ”
298.085	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Page 4.5-42, second to last paragraph. This section should be clarified to state that the NPDES permit for the FCPP is written to ensure that it is in compliance with NNEPA water quality standards.	Not all constituents required to be monitored for the NPDES have tribal standards (e.g., oil and grease, flow). The following sentence has been added to the EIS: Further, the NPDES permit includes monitoring for some constituents for which NNEPA standards exist; these permit limits match the NNEPA standards.
298.086	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Page 4.5-42, last paragraph. As noted earlier, roads used to maintain the transmission lines can affect the water quality of the many water bodies they cross, and road and possible environmental impacts should be discussed in this section.	Impacts to surface water quality resulting from transmission lines is included on page 4.5-59 of the Draft EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
298.087	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Page 4.5-43, second paragraph. It is stated that two existing livestock wells are not currently being used because regulated constituents in the water exceed livestock criteria. It is unclear how the determination was made that these wells are not being used. Exceedance of standards alone does not prevent the use of non-compliant wells.	Use of wells (or lack thereof) was provided by applicant. Added in Citation for the Pinabete Permit application at the end of this sentence.
298.088	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Page 4.5-44, second paragraph. Table 4.5-5 does not provide a comparison of wells within the areas of CCR placement to baseline Fruitland coals. No table does this, and one should be developed for the FEIS.	The data for the analysis is provided from the CHIA. Baseline characterization for Fruitland Formation Baseline Quality is presented in the CHIA at Section 4.2.4.4. The assessment of the Fruitland Formation and PCS Formation is presented in Section 5.3.5.3, and a subsection specific to CCB disposal is presented at Section 5.3.5.3.1. Additionally, a Coal Combustion Byproduct Assessment is provided in the CHIA at Appendix G.
298.089	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Page 4.5-57, second paragraph. There is no discussion of the groundwater under the dry fly ash disposal area (DFADA) in the Affected Environment section. All parameters in Table 4.5-6 that exceed the MCL should be addressed, not just selenium.	Table 4.5-7 has been revised to provide columns showing constituent concentrations for background wells (MW-41, MW-43, MW-12R). In addition a note has been added to the original three columns indicating that they represent the min, max, and average values of all other monitoring wells beneath the ash disposal area. Text summarizing the data has also been added to page 4.5-24.
298.090	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Page 4.5-57, third paragraph. Information available to the Nation suggests that the trench was excavated into the Lewis Shale, but not to the bottom of it. This statement should be verified	Sentence has been revised to state that the trench was excavated to the Lewis Shale.
298.091	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Pages 4.5-59 to 4.5-60: BMPs for transmission line roads should include berms and/or rolling dips to reduce erosion.	APS and PNM have included applicant proposed measures to reduce erosion as described on pages 3-38 and 3-39 of the Draft EIS. No change made to the EIS.
298.092	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	4.5.4.2 Alternative B—Navajo Mine Extension Project Page 4.5-60. The increased flow into No Name Arroyo caused by diverting water from Pinabete Arroyo would likely increase erosion within the former arroyo, and the possibility of further erosion should be addressed in the FEIS.	The analysis is at a comparable level as for the proposed action and allows meaningful comparison of the effects of the alternatives.
298.093	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Any changes made to the BA should be incorporated into the EIS to make a more thorough and accurate document. In order to facilitate this, NNDFW is ready, willing and able to assist OSM and the consultants in the ongoing consultation process as a cooperating agency.	Thank you for your note and the EIS has been updated with the Final Section 7 consultation results and the BA/BO.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
298.094	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	In regards to Section 4.6 on Vegetation, the Nation would like to point out that Navajo Mine operators have historically been diligent about promptly re-vegetating areas of the mine that are mined-out. The Nation would like to emphasize that all seed mixes used for re-vegetation should consist solely of native seeds. Though it is generally not uncommon for seed mixes to consist of a mix of native and exotic seeds, we feel this approach is risky and unnecessary. Many of the plants that are currently considered to be noxious weeds were purposely introduced to the landscape for restoration-related purposes. In the event that Navajo Mine is currently using a seed mix that includes exotic species, we recommend changing to an all-native seed mix.	Thank you for your comment.
298.095	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>Section 4.10 Socioeconomics 4.10.2.2: Economic Conditions</p> <p>Page 4.10-13. Table 4.10-13 should be modified as follows: Table 4.10-13 Summary of Navajo Nation Taxes and Royalties Paid by BNCC (SEE COMMENT LETTER 0298 FOR TABLE).</p> <p>By way of explanation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The Nation does not receive Fuel Excise Tax from BNCC, so that row should be removed. It is unclear why there were figures inserted into 2008 and 2009 for Fuel Excise Taxes. An explanation of where those numbers came from would be helpful.</li> <li>2) The tribal Royalty payments were accurate.</li> <li>3) The Annual Average needs to be corrected.</li> <li>4) The information in this chart comes from the Navajo Tax Commission and should be noted as such.</li> </ol>	Suggested edits have been made
298.096	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>Page 4.10-25 Although the DEIS mentions NTEC purchased Navajo Mine in section 4.10.3, section 10.3.2 mentions some compelling economic contribution statistics tailored solely to San Juan County and State of New Mexico. There is no mention of the economic impacts to Navajo Nation revenues in light of the NTEC purchase of the mine. Inclusion of similar references of the projects' economic contributions to the Navajo Nation would make the economic analysis more complete and more relevant.</p> <p>The tables referenced below illustrate the economic contributions of the Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant to San Juan County and State of New Mexico. The Nation recommends that similar tables addressing economic contributions to the Navajo Nation be included.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Table 4.10-7- Current Economic Contribution to San Juan County, New Mexico (2011) for Navajo Mine</li> <li>• Table 4.10-8- Current Economic Contribution to State of New Mexico (2011) for Navajo Mine</li> </ul>	<p>Section 4.10.3.2 includes the following language: "Now that NTEC owns the Navajo Mine, the baseline fiscal contribution of the Navajo Mine to the Navajo Nation is expected to be higher than the estimated \$28.1 million with existing ownership. Because NTEC would be exempt from some local, state, and Federal taxes, net revenues after taxes would be higher, so conceivably more revenue would be available to the tribal government." Thus, acknowledging the additional potential benefits to the Navajo Nation from NTEC's ownership of Navajo Mine.</p> <p>However, based on information provided by the Navajo Nation, the following details have been included for clarification: From 2004 to 2013, the Navajo Nation has received an average of \$29.1 million per year in coal royalty payments from the Navajo Mine and an average of \$7.0 million per year from FCPP lease payments.</p> <p>Fiscal Impacts in Section 4.10.3.2 provides specific information on the monetary benefits the Navajo Nation receives from Project operations.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Table 4.10-9- Current Economic Contribution for San Juan County, New Mexico (2011) for Four Corners Power Plant</li> <li>• Table 4.10-10- Current Economic Contribution to State of New Mexico (2011) for Four Corners Power Plant</li> </ul>	
298.097	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>4.11 Environmental Justice</p> <p>The DEIS adequately describes the federal responsibility in addressing environmental justice consultation requirements pursuant to federal law and guidance. The Nation will continue to work with OSM in consultations for environmental justice issues.</p>	Thank you for your comment.
298.098	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>On page 4.11-20 and continues on to 4.11-23, the DEIS discusses the transportation of ammonia versus the transportation of urea. Nation also has concern regarding the storage on site and transportation of ammonia in connection with emission reduction technologies proposed. Ammonia is a required component in the operation of selective catalytic reduction (SCR) controls. The three types of ammonia source being considered by FCPP are anhydrous ammonia, aqueous ammonia, and solid urea-derived. Storage of anhydrous ammonia would require 8 tanks of 20,000 gallons capacity each and 12 truck shipments per week, aqueous ammonia would require 18 tanks of 20,000 gallons capacity each and 29 truck shipments per week, and dry urea would require 18 tanks of 20,000 gallons capacity each and 17 truck shipments per week. Considering the risk factors involved with the storage and transportation, the Nation strongly endorses OSM's recommendation of the use of urea over anhydrous ammonia and aqueous ammonia.</p>	The following clarification has been included: "The operation of SCR devices on Units 4 and 5 would require the use of ammonia and hydrated lime. Any potential spills of urea (a type of ammonia) or lime during transport, or on-site would be unlikely to drain to nearby surface water features since both would be transported in dry form."
298.099	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>4.11.1 Alternative A—Proposed Action</p> <p>Page 4.11-14, sixth paragraph. The first sentence should start: "Future operation of FCPP would emit. . ."</p>	Suggested edits have been made
298.100	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>Section 4.12 Indian Trust Assets</p> <p>On page 4.11-43, the second sentence in the first paragraph of this section states "An ITA can be anything that is owned or has established right of use (such as a lease) by a tribe or individual and that has a monetary value." This sentence is inconsistent with the first sentence and should be deleted.</p>	Suggested edits have been made
298.101	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>The parentheticals and statements illustrating examples found throughout section 4.12 are not necessary and should be struck from the document. The parentheticals give less weight to the statements and potentially exclude valid considerations not included in parentheticals.</p>	The parentheticals are important to communicate the full meaning.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
298.102	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Further, Navajo Nation’s General Leasing Regulations have been signed by the Secretary of the Interior. This would render the next to last sentence in the first paragraph of section 4.12 inaccurate. The Nation suggests adding “unless otherwise provided by federal law” to the end of the sentence “ITAs cannot be sold or leased without prior approval....”	Suggested edits have been made
298.103	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>Paragraph 4.12.2.3 should be rewritten to accurately reflect the recent action by the New Mexico District Court recognizing the Nation’s water rights in the San Juan River Basin in New Mexico and to reflect that unquantified water rights are trust assets. The paragraph should be rewritten as:</p> <p>The 1908 Supreme Court decision in <i>Winters v. United States</i>, known as the Winters Doctrine, decreed that the establishment of an Indian reservation also required that a sufficient amount of water be reserved for the tribe’s present and future use. The Winters Doctrine allows for a legal process, as determined by a judge or arbitrator, for settling water rights between the U.S. and Indian Tribes <u>when those rights</u> are not clearly defined. According to the Winters Doctrine, nonuse of reserved water will not result in forfeiture of the reserved water rights. The Navajo Nation’s and Hopi Tribe’s surface and groundwater rights, <u>whether quantified or unquantified</u>, are ITAs. <u>The Navajo Nation’s water rights in and the State of New Mexico settled their water right on the San Juan River Basin in New Mexico have been quantified pursuant to a settlement agreement between the Nation, the United States and the State of New Mexico executed in December 2010-2005. The District Court for the San Juan Adjudication in New Mexico entered signed the Supplemental Partial Final and Partial Final Decree on November 1, 2013, quantifying that approved the Navajo Nation’s allocation of the San Juan River. This water right partially quantified-These water rights from the San Juan Basin</u> are based on historic use and reserved water rights.</p>	Suggested edits have been made
298.104	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>Section 4.15 Hazardous and Solid Wastes</p> <p>4.15.1.1 Federal Regulations</p> <p>On page 4.15-1, RCRA is cited as “42 U.S.C. Part 6901 et seq.”. “Part” is used in the Code of Federal Regulations; “Section” is used in the U.S. Code. This should say “42 U.S.C. § 6901 et seq.”</p>	Suggested edits have been made
298.105	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>The second sentence at 4.15.1.1 should read:</p> <p>RCRA defines solid and hazardous waste, authorizes EPA to set standards <u>applicable to the owners and operators of hazardous waste treatment, storage and disposal facilities for facilities that and to hazardous waste generators and transporters, or manage hazardous waste</u>, establishes a permit program for hazardous waste treatment, storage, and disposal facilities, and authorizes EPA to set criteria for disposal facilities that accept municipal solid waste <u>and other solid waste</u>.</p>	Suggested edits have been made

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
298.106	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>Also on page 4.15-1, in reference to the Amendments of 1984. The Amendments prohibited land disposal of hazardous waste without pretreatment or a demonstration that land disposal will not result in hazardous waste migration. See 98 Stat. 3227-28. In addition, the Amendments did not establish criteria applicable to municipal solid waste landfills; EPA established those criteria under RCRA authorization in 40 CFR Part 258. This sentence should be revised as follows:</p> <p>The amendments set deadlines for permit issuance, prohibited the land disposal of many types of hazardous waste without prior treatment <u>or a demonstration that land disposal will not result in hazardous waste migration</u>, <del>established criteria applicable to municipal solid waste landfills</del>, and established a new program regulating underground storage tanks.</p>	Suggested edits have been made
298.107	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>Also on page 4.15-1, the sentence referring to 40 CFR Part 260 reads as though this is the only place where RCRA related regulations are found. However, 40 CFR Parts 239-282 contain all RCRA-related regulations. See EPA, "Resource Conservation and Recovery Act." at <a href="http://www.epa.gov/oecaagct/lrca.html">http://www.epa.gov/oecaagct/lrca.html</a>.</p>	The citation is relevant for the issue.
298.108	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>On pages 4.15-1 through 4.15-2, the citations for these sections are incorrect. As noted earlier, "Part" is not the proper citation for the Code. The proper citations are 15 U.S.C. § 2641 et seq. and 42 U.S.C. § 7401 et seq.; 15 U.S.C. § 2601 et seq.; and 42 U.S.C. § 11001 et seq., respectively.</p>	Suggested edits have been made
298.109	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>The summary regarding Section 304 of the emergency notification requirements is somewhat misleading. It is recommended that the sentence be revised to say: "EPCRA Section 304 requires facilities to notify the Tribal Emergency Response Commission in three circumstances: first, there is a release of an extremely hazardous substance listed in 40 CFR Part 355 for which notification is required under CERCLA § 103(a); second, there is a release of an extremely hazardous substance listed in 40 CFR Part 355, notice is not required under CERCLA § 103(a) but the release occurs in a manner that would require such notice, and the release exceeds an amount for which notice is required; and third, there is a release of substance which is not an extremely hazardous substance listed in 40 CFR Part 335 but for which notification is required under CERCLA § 103(a) and a reportable quantity has been established under CERCLA § 102(a) or more than a pound has been released."</p>	This discussion is no longer relevant because APS has committed to the urea transport option.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
298.110	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	On page 4.15-3, in the first and second full paragraphs, any reference to terms “tribal lands” and “their lands” be changed to “Indian country,” which has a specific meaning in federal laws and regulations affecting tribes. For further explanation, see <a href="http://www2.epa.gov/toxics-release-inventory-tri-program/tri-reporting-indian-country">http://www2.epa.gov/toxics-release-inventory-tri-program/tri-reporting-indian-country</a> . The rule being referred to is “Toxics Release Inventory (TRI) Reporting for Facilities Located in Indian Country and Clarification of Additional Opportunities Available to Tribal Governments Under the TRI Program,” 77 Fed. Reg. 23409 (April 19, 2012).	This does not affect the analysis or presentation.
298.111	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	On page 4.15-3, the citation should be 27 CFR Part 555, Subpart K.	Suggested edits have been made
298.112	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	4.15.4 Environmental Consequences On page 4.15-17, Table 4.15-6, This table repeatedly refers to the definition of “hazardous material” in 40 CFR 302. 40 CFR § 302.3 (part of EPCRA) defines “hazardous substance” as “any substance designated pursuant to 40 CFR part 302.” However, 40 CFR § 302.3 does not define “hazardous material.”	This does not affect the analysis or presentation.
298.113	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	4.15.4.1 Alternative A—Proposed Action On page 4.15-27, CCR management discusses fly ash disposal. As a suggestion, in order to reduce onsite storage, the Nation recommends that FCPP look into increasing their sales of fly ash for commercial use which is currently only at 20%.	Thank you for your comment.
298.114	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Appendix A A.1.1 Acid Rain Program On page A-1, FPCC is subject to Part 71 permitting requirements “under the authority of” both NNEPA and EPA, not just NNEPA. NNEPA received delegated authority to administer a Part 71 operating permit program for affected sources, including FCPP, but EPA and NNEPA have joint enforcement authority under the delegation agreement. Further, the Part 72 Acid Rain Program requirements appear to be enforceable by NNEPA and EPA because NNEPA administers the acid rain program. The following changes are suggested: “FCPP is subject to both Parts 71 and 72 as administered by the Navajo Nation EPA and EPA and is required to hold sufficient Part 73 SO <sub>2</sub> allowances to cover annual emissions.”	The text was modified to include the phrase “under the authority of both NNEPA and EPA.” The clarifying language provided in the comment is also included.
298.115	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	Also on page A-1, the text cites to Section 821 of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 7401-7671, et seq. Pursuant to the section in this document called “General Comments,” please change Section 821 to 40 CFR Part 98.	“Section 821” was changed to “40 CFR Part 98.”

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
298.116	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>A.2 PSD Permitting Requirements</p> <p>On page A-4, the summary discusses application of PSD and NSR. This summary is misleading, as it contrasts NSR (which contains nonattainment and PSD permitting programs) with PSD (which is part of NSR). In fact, EPA Region IX has a page dedicated to definitions of these terms. In addition, VOCs are not criteria pollutants with NAAQS and should not be included in the list of pollutants than contribute to nonattainment. It would be more accurate to say: "In contrast, nonattainment permitting applies to new major sources or major modifications at existing major sources located in areas of NAAQS nonattainment (e.g., major sources emitting NOx and PM10 in large urban areas), and is more stringent than PSD. For example, if an area is in attainment for CO and nonattainment for ozone, PSD requirements would apply to CO emissions while nonattainment requirements would apply to NOx."</p>	The comment refers to the inclusion of VOCs as criteria pollutants. The criteria pollutant ozone is not directly emitted; however, its precursor compounds NOx and VOCs are emitted and react with sunlight to form ground-level photochemical ozone. No change made.
298.117	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>Also on page A-4, the document discusses criteria pollutants. As is stated in a previous comment, VOCs are not criteria pollutants with NAAQS and should therefore be excluded from this list.</p>	As indicated in associated comment responses, the criteria pollutant ozone is not directly emitted, rather, its precursors NOx and VOCs are the criteria emittents (regulated pollutants) which react with sunlight to form ground-level photochemical ozone. Appropriate text was changed to clarify references to VOCs as criteria "emittents" rather than "pollutants."
298.118	Mr.	Ben	Shelley	The Navajo Nation	06/30/14	<p>Page A-5 discusses the D.C. Circuit Court decision without citing to it. As noted in a previous comment, the case is Sierra Club v. EPA, 2014 WL 2619824 (D.C. Cir. 2014).</p>	Thank you for your comment.
299.001	Mr.	Raymond	Hagerman		06/27/14	<p>Between the Navajo Mine and the Four Corners Power plant, several hundred persons are employed in our region. Further, in the event Alternative E (No action) occurs, APS shareholders will likely not invest in the appropriate BART equipment, the facilities would be shut down and the combined direct and indirect job loss would be over 2000 and a loss of \$150 million in annual payroll.</p>	Thank you for your comment.
300.001	Ms.	Sherry	Galloway		06/27/14	No substantive comment	Thank you for your comment.
301.001	Mr.	Steven	Perkins		06/27/14	<p>The proposed Project is vital to the economy of San Juan County and the Navajo Nation, and without the Project employment opportunities will be lost and social services such as education and health care will suffer. Additionally, the draft EIS demonstrates that the Project can be implemented, and the economic benefits derived, in a manner that is environmentally sustainable and compatible with the local communities.</p>	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS and will notify the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in spring of 2015.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
302.001	Ms.	Sarah	White		06/27/14	Resident human health remains at high risk in the impacted areas from both coal ash and the coal burning power plant. The DEIS claims that health impacts from 25 more years of FCPP and Navajo Mine would be minor when there are known public health crises throughout the area. I would count more than half the population in the Four Corners area suffering from Respiratory, Kidney, Heart, Digestive System, And Central Brain Problems, Meningitis, Cancer, and rheumatoid Arthritis from living in this pollution, so don't tell me there is no health impact in the Four Corners. The DEIS complete failure on public health represents one of the worst environmental justice situations in the country.	Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS addresses health and safety; specifically, pages 4.17-22 through 4/17-24 summarize the results of the human health risk assessment conducted for the project.
303.001	Mr.	Tim	Ramirez		06/27/14	If these businesses are not allowed to continue this will greatly impact my ability to live the same.	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS and will notify the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in spring 2015.
304.001	Ms.	Victoria	Gutierrez		06/27/14	The open-house format doesn't work for Navajo. We need public speaking.	Please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format
304.002	Ms.	Victoria	Gutierrez		06/27/14	So this EIS is poorly done. The people giving information didn't have the answers to questions not only myself but other community people had. There was one picture board about coal ash and the representative said, that they are planning to bury the ash, where it is at. The community member asked, what about the contamination to the Chaco Wash and the San Juan River. Again OSM representatives stated it will take 200 year's before it pollutes the river's! The community member stated, that is horrible. What about The Future Generations!?! What kind of water sources will they be drinking? And what future are we leaving our next generation.	Please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format
304.003	Ms.	Victoria	Gutierrez		06/27/14	Community people and family member's also asked for interpretation in Navajo disk. They said to write a request for one, we do not have them readily available, and to date NO disk has been sent.	Please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format and Master Response #10, Translation of the EIS.
304.004	Ms.	Victoria	Gutierrez		06/27/14	I also stated that, The Shiprock EIS should have been done at the Shiprock Chapter House. Not out of the way at the Shiprock H.S., where there is no signage showing there is an EIS going on. He stated that the place was booked because of space, I informed him that the Shiprock Chapter is big enough for their poster boards.	Please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format
304.005	Ms.	Victoria	Gutierrez			He informed me that OSM contacted the local chapter's about the EIS. And I also told him that not even the Chapter officials knew what an EIS was. Told him at Chapter meetings we've been too that no one knew, then I asked how was the notice sent, he said through mail. I said simply sending out the 1,500 page book to each chapter doesn't inform anyone.	Please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format. Section 1 and 4.11 summarize the public outreach conducted as part of the project.
305.001	Mr.	Vincent H.	Yazzie		06/27/14	Retransmitting with correct subject line. Attached Excel file is updated. Four Corners Power Plant (FCPP) exceeds capacity. See lines 153, 154, 159, 160, 163, 169, 171 and column U. SCR only designed for 1.540	The SCR devices will be engineered to meet the requirements of BART. Operational output for Units 4 and 5 with SCR equipment installed are analyzed in the EIS, based on historical operational performance data.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p>GW. FCPP will not be able to handle the extra ammonia from the SCR. Unit 4 can exceed 0.80 GW. There were exceptions to BART settlement which was the ability of FCPP to handle the ammonia. FCPP needs to install and engineer an ammonia system for a power plant capacity of 1.62 GW if FCPP unit 5 can later reach 0.81 GW Lines 92 to 181 is Four Corners power plant unit 4.</p> <p>Total Power (GW) is the addition of the power of units 4 and 5. Unit 4 can exceed 40% efficiency which might be impossible. Unit 5 efficiency looks about right. Have not calculated carbon content of the coal.</p>	
306.001	Mr.	Vincent H.	Yazzie		06/27/14	<p>Retransmitting with correct subject line and subject page numbers. Attached Excel file is updated. Four Corners Power Plant (FCPP) exceeds capacity. See lines 153, 154, 159, 160, 163, 169, 171 and column U in attached file DLY_2014nmQ1.xlsx. SCR only designed for 1.540 GW. FCPP will not be able to handle the extra ammonia from the SCR. Unit 4 can exceed 0.80 GW. There were exceptions to BART settlement which was the ability of FCPP to handle the ammonia. FCPP needs to install and engineer an ammonia system for a power plant capacity of 1.62 GW if FCPP unit 5 can later reach 0.81 GW Lines 92 to 181 is Four Corners power plant unit 4. Total Power (GW) is the addition of the power of units 4 and 5. Unit 4 can exceed 40% efficiency which might be impossible. Unit 5 efficiency looks about right. Have not calculated carbon content of the coal. The historic baseline is off, Volume 1, Background and Overview, Two Federal actions were completed prior to the Draft EIS: OSM's approval of a SMCRA permit transfer associated with the equity sale and merger of Navajo Mine Coal Company (NMCC) with the Navajo Transitional Energy Company (NTEC), including all assets formerly held by BNCC, and the US Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) issuance of a Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) for the installation of Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART) at the FCPP. Unit 4 and 5 can exceed 1.540 GW giving wrong emission data for the background. Volume 1, Page 3, Executive Summary. BART mentioned 6 times. Unfortunately, the Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) was based upon wrong emission data. Units 4 and 5, can add +/- 5% of error to the emissions data. Units 1, 2, and 3 emission data not checked. Units 4 and 5 were engineered for a higher power rating. Units 1, 2, and 3 were most likely engineered for a higher power rating. The FIP plan is off. Table ES-1, Volume 1, page 3, Executive Summary is off. Summary Comparison of Historic and Future Emission Rates is off as Units 4 and 5 engineered for higher power rating. Modeled emissions is off. As I said before, model emissions used sub-bituminous coal of 8,800 btu/lb. Moisture free, mineral free, ash free coal is around 11,700 btu/lb. EPA refused to re-run the model. Attached is APS report saying BHP misapplied ASTM D-388-05 by entering 22.3% ash as "0.223." Report is EPA-R09-OAR-2010-0683-0056(1).pdf.</p>	<p>Air: The air quality analysis in the EIS was conducted with historic operational data from the FCPP, including operation of Units 4 and 5. Future emission estimates are based on the highest year's data; therefore, are conservative estimates based on historic operational data. The analysis in the EIS assumes FCPP conformance with the Federal Implementation Plan and Best Available Retrofit Technology.</p> <p>Alternatives: OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
306.002	Mr.	Vincent H.	Yazzie		06/27/14	<p>Errors in power rating and emissions will elevate Historic Baseline Emissions. Estimated future emission will be higher with the illegal power rating of FCPP. Future versus Historic Baseline percentages will be lower due to the illegal power rating of FCPP. Volume 1, 3. Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives. page 3-1. BART FIP based upon bad BHP coal rank data and illegal FCPP Power Rating. Emissions need to be redone and BART FIP redone. Options were based upon bad data. Volume 1. 3.2.1.2. FCPP page 3-14 to 3-15. BART FIP based upon bad BHP coal rank data and illegal FCPP Power Rating. Emissions need to be redone and BART FIP redone. Volume 1. 3.2.1.2. FCPP page 3-15. BART FIP based upon bad BHP coal rank data and illegal FCPP Power Rating. Emissions need to be redone and BART FIP redone. Options were based upon bad data. APS lied about the power rating of FCPP it is actually higher. Volume 1. 3.3.4.2. FCPP page 3-53. This is a good alternative. FCPP has lied about their power rating. BHP lied about the coal rank. So much fraud in the BART FIP process (illegal power rating) and BHP coal rank errors, modeling errors. Also FCPP and Utah International used fly ash as fertilizer in the soil for Watson pit, Dodge Pit and Bitsui Pit. Fly_ash_soil.jpg is where fly ash from pre-1977 is draining into the San Juan River damaging endangered fish down stream. Soil in this area needs to be removed and put in lined pits. Also BHP does tolerated criminals among its superintendents for 2 years. Two men arrested for allegedly stealing \$480K of fuel from BHP Billiton</p> <p>NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE E IS THE FINAL SOLUTION.</p> <p>ps will be adding more</p>	<p>Air: The air quality analysis in the EIS was conducted with historic operational data from the FCPP, including operation of Units 4 and 5. Future emission estimates are based on the average of the two highest year's data; therefore, are conservative estimates based on historic operational data. The analysis in the EIS assumes FCPP conformance with the Federal Implementation Plan and Best Available Retrofit Technology.</p> <p>Alternatives: OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.</p>
306.003	Mr.	Vincent H.	Yazzie		06/27/14	<p>APS engineered the plant to burn higher density coal. BART is mentioned twice in volume 1, Executive summary, FCPP, page 12. There will be more ammonia to handle and the SCR has to be re-engineered for a higher flow of ammonia, more ammonia storage facilities, and more ammonia trucks. Volume 1, Executive Summary, Interim Period (2014-2018), page 12-13 EPA BART FIP was meant to coverup that FCPP was burning higher energy density coal using a secret higher output rating power-plant. EPA BART FIP was based upon bad data and bad engineering. Emissions are off. EPA BART FIP is a bad baseline and should not be relied upon. FCPP emissions need to be analyzed again for another baseline. Were units 1, 2, and 3 engineered for a higher power rating? Volume 1, 1.1.2, Four Corners Power Plant, page 1-2, 1-3. BART FIP was based upon false modeling and false emissions data. The resulting options for FCPP should never have been offered. Bad BHP coal rank data, illegal FCPP power rating, bad EPA emission modeling results in BAD BART FIP. Volume 1, 1.4.2.4, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, page 1-12. BART FIP based upon bad BHP coal rank data and illegal FCPP Power Rating. Emissions need to be redone and BART FIP redone. Volume 1, 2. Current Operations of Navajo Mine, FCPP and Transmission lines, page 2-1. BART FIP based upon bad BHP coal rank data and illegal FCPP Power Rating. Emissions need to be</p>	<p>The EIS provides analysis of risks and hazards associated with the ammonia source for the selective catalytic reduction (SCR) devices, furthermore the EIS has been updated to indicate that APS has committed to the urea transport option. SCR devices will be engineered to meet the requirements of the Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) and Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART). Operational output for Units 4 and 5 with SCR equipment installed are analyzed in the EIS, based on historical operational performance data. The air quality analysis in the EIS was conducted with historic operational data from the FCPP, including operation of Units 4 and 5. Future emission estimates are based on the average of the two highest year's data; therefore, are conservative estimates based on historic operational data. The analysis in the EIS assumes FCPP conformance with the FIP and BART.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						redone and BART FIP redone. Volume 1, 2.2 Four Corners Power Plant Operations, page 2-18. Unit 4 was re-engineered in 1969 to be an 810 MW or more. Units 1, 2, 3, and 5 need to be rechecked if they were engineered for a higher rating. BART FIP based upon bad BHP coal rank data and illegal FCPP Power Rating. Emissions need to be redone and BART FIP redone. Volume 1, 2.4.2. EPA Federal Implementation Plan for Best-Available-Retrofit-Technology (Post 2014). Page 2-35. When FCPP operated plant beyond 1.540 GW, FCPP was illegally emitting emissions into the environment and violating BART and BART FIP plan. Volume 1, 2.4.2.2 Actions to Comply with BART Ruling Page 2-36 BART FIP based upon bad BHP coal rank data and illegal FCPP Power Rating. Emissions need to be redone and BART FIP redone. Options were based upon bad data. Volume 1, 2.4.2.2 Installation on SCR Equipment on Units 4 and 5 Page 2-37 to 2-38. More ammonia truck, bigger SCR, bigger tanks as Unit 4 and Unit 5 combined exceeded 1.540 GW producing more illegal emissions. I am afraid the original reduced emissions in Table 2-8 is not true.	
307.001	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	Footnote 2 on page 2, A major component of the DEIS is whether BIA should approve the lease (Lease #3) for the FCPP. As such, a copy of lease #3 should be an appendix to the DEIS so the terms of the lease can be reviewed by the public and subject to comment. OSM's failure to produce this crucial document as an appendix to the DEIS is arbitrary, capricious, and denies the public of meaningful input into a major component of the DEIS. We ask that the lease #3 be released to the public as a component of the DEIS and that the public be given an adequate amount of time to review and comment on the terms of the lease as part of the DEIS public comment process.	Lease Amendment #3, one of the project actions that triggered NEPA review, contains sensitive information regarding the financial nature of the lease; thus, a full copy of Lease Amendment #3 is not included as an appendix to the EIS. The relevant information contained in the Lease is directly summarized in the Draft EIS, and the consequences of BIA approval is analyzed throughout the document. This disclosure of the lease terms in the Draft EIS is sufficient to facilitate public review and comment; disclosure of the entire amendment would not change the alternatives analyzed or any of the conclusions within the Draft EIS. Public comment on the amendment itself is not part of this NEPA process.
307.002	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	With these comments, we ask OSM and the Cooperating Agencies to correct the inadequacies in the DEIS's analysis of impacts, and to provide real consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives that include transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and FCPP. Once OSM and the Cooperating Agencies have made the necessary corrections, we request that OSM and the Cooperating Agencies re-issue the DEIS for public comment. It is only when these deficiencies are corrected, the impacts and costs of the plant are properly assessed, and appropriate alternatives considered, that OSM and the Cooperating Agencies will have a rational basis for making any decision regarding the mine and plant.	Please see Master Response #6, Recirculation of the EIS.
307.003	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	Most of the Conservation Groups also submitted numerous comment letters regarding the transfer of the Navajo Mine from BHP Billiton to the Navajo Transitional Energy Company (Navajo Mine SMCRA Permit NM-0003F Transfer), including a letter sent on June 7, 2013, comments on the Environmental Assessment submitted on June 17, 2013, supplemental comments submitted on June 24, 2013, and supplemental comments submitted on September 27, 2013. (Conservation Groups'	See Master Response #7 for an explanation regarding the Navajo Mine Permit Transfer EA relationship to the Draft EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p>comments regarding the mine transfer are attached as Exhibits 3-7.) Diné C.A.R.E. also sent letters (via electronic mail and postal mail) to the office of Secretary of the Interior, Sally Jewell, to the office of U.S. Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, to the office of Deputy Inspector General, which are all within the Department of the Interior (“DOI”). These letters outlined concerns by Diné community members about the rushed Navajo Mine purchase, the Navajo Mine transfer permit, the exclusion of BIA’s approval, and other concerns. As of June 24, 2014, no response has been received by any of the DOI’s offices.</p> <p>These comments letters are incorporated herein by reference. The Conservation Groups believe that OSM illegally segmented the mine sale from this DEIS and thus this DEIS is deficient for failing to analyze the mine sale as part of this DEIS.</p>	
307.004	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>Diné C.A.R.E. provided comments during the Navajo Mine/FCPP EIS Scoping comment period in the fall of 2012. Those comments included a section noting that OSM must consider and respond to the FLD in the DEIS. (See Conservation Groups’ Scoping Comments at 6-8.) Yet, the DEIS failed to consider FLD, especially as it pertains to coal combustion waste, climate change, environmental justice, water impacts, health impacts, socioeconomics, and endangered species. For these categories, the DEIS states that prolonging mining and power plant operations for an additional 25 years would cause minor to no impacts.</p> <p>Diné C.A.R.E. would like to know why the following principles of the FDL were not considered in the DEIS:</p> <p>§4.E. “It is the right and freedom of the people that every child and every elder be respected, honored and protected with a healthy physical and mental environment, free from all abuse.”</p> <p>§5.A. “The four sacred elements of life, air, light/fire, water and earth/pollen in all their forms must be respected, honored and protected for they sustain life.”</p> <p>§5.C. “All creation, from Mother Earth to Father Sky to the animals, those who live in water, those who fly and plant life have their own laws, and have rights and freedom to exist.”</p> <p>§5.D. “The Diné have a sacred obligation and duty to respect, preserve and protect all that was provided for we were designated as the steward of these relatives through our use of the sacred gifts of language and thinking.”</p> <p>§5.E. “Mother Earth and Father Sky is part of us as the Diné and the Diné is part of Mother Earth and Father Sky; The Diné must treat this sacred bond with love and respect without exerting dominance for we do not own our mother or father.”</p> <p>§5.F. “The rights and freedoms of the people to the use of the sacred elements of life as mentioned above and to the use of the land, natural resources, sacred sites and other living beings must be accomplished</p>	<p>Diné Law reflects the importance to the Navajo Nation that their lands and resources are managed in accordance with the Tribe’s cultural beliefs. Diné Law emphasizes the deep relationship of the Navajo with the Earth and outlines the Navajo “way of life”. OSMRE recognizes and respects the intent and nature of this tribal policy, but it is the responsibility of the Navajo Nation alone to enforce/consider Diné Law in making decisions. The purpose of NEPA is to assess how project alternatives could potentially affect the ecological and the human environment, thus, the NEPA process reflects some of the concepts of environmental stewardship outlined in Diné Law . Diné Law , however, does not include any measureable and enforceable regulatory standards that could be technically applied to the vast majority of resources analyzed in the EIS. In order to clarify the role of Diné Law in this NEPA process, the EIS has been revised to include the following language in Section 1.4.2.6: Chapter 1 (Purpose &amp; Need) on the applicability of Diné Law on the Project: Footnote: It is worth noting that in 2007 the Navajo Nation developed legislation (1 N.N.C. §§ 201-206) that codified Diné Law . Diné Law explains the origin of the Navajo people and their relationship with the Earth. This Navajo law is considered cultural in nature and lacks any measurable and enforceable regulatory standards that could be technically applied to measure effects; therefore, Diné Law is not used as a regulatory framework in this EIS. Further information on Diné Law, related to the use of the hogan at the Navajo Mine for traditional Navajo ceremonies for purposes of mitigating adverse impacts to the natural world from resource extraction, can be found on page 4.11-17.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						through the proper protocol of respect and offering and these practices must be protected and preserved for they are the foundation of our spiritual ceremonies and the Diné life way.”  §5.G. “It is the duty and responsibility of the Diné to protect and preserve the beauty of the natural world for future generations.”	
307.005	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	As an initial matter, the DEIS fails to provide clarity about who is acting as the Project Proponent seeking the permits subject to the NEPA review in the DEIS. Ownership of the Navajo Mine was transferred to the Navajo Nation on December 31, 2013. The DEIS does not make it clear whether this transfer included a wholesale adoption of the permit applications previously submitted by BHP, or whether those permit applications are subject to change now that the Navajo Nation is the owner of the mine. The DEIS notes only that the DEIS analyzes “approval of Navajo Mine’s application” for a new SMCRA permit, and “[r]enewal of Navajo Mine’s existing SMCRA permit.” DEIS at 1-1 (emphasis added).	The Project Proponent for the SMCRA permit is NTEC; MMCo (formerly BHP Navajo Mine Company) is the operator of the mine, and will continue to hold some of the permits, as described in the Draft EIS. Further information on permit status, beyond that provided in the Draft EIS, is available in the Permit Transfer EA conducted for OSMRE’s decision whether to transfer the SMCRA permit from BHP Navajo Mine to NTEC.
307.006	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	The DEIS must identify and disclose all documents related to the purchase of the mine by the Navajo Nation from BHP to allow the public a full understanding of the nature of the transaction and its implications. OSM’s failure to analyze the mine sale as part of this DEIS constitutes an illegal segmentation of the project.	See Master Response #7 for an explanation regarding the Navajo Mine Permit Transfer EA relationship to the Draft EIS. In regard to the request for due diligence documents, these are developed as part of a transaction to inform business decisions, therefore, such documentation is not a part of the Proposed Project evaluated in the Draft EIS.
307.007	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	OSM has inappropriately allowed Navajo Nation to continue to participate in formulation of the DEIS even where the status of Navajo Nation changed from agency oriented actions to a proponent of continued operations at Navajo Mine (as new owner). This situation presents a conflict of interest that OSM has failed to address or remedy. Further, as noted elsewhere in this comment letter, the Navajo Nation has contracted away its rights to enforce its tribal environmental standards on the FCPP, further evidencing its conflict of interest in this matter.	NTEC is an LLC created by the Navajo Nation and is a project applicant. In their purchase of the mine and with the transfer of the SMCRA permit, NTEC has stepped into the role of BHP Navajo Mine Company. The Navajo Nation is not a project applicant. They are a Cooperating Agency due to their tribal trust lands involved, issuance of the 401 Clean Water Act Certification, and jurisdiction over the project. The Navajo Nation is not the lead agency for the NEPA process, and at most can provide input for OSMRE’s consideration during development of the Draft EIS.  For the role of the Navajo Nation in the enforcement of tribal standards at FCPP, please see Master Response 11, Covenant 17.
307.008	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	In addition to failing to explain who is acting as the Project Proponent, the DEIS presents a muddled picture of the applicable regulatory structure at the mine and power plant. The DEIS states that under covenant 17 of APS’s lease for the FCPP, the Navajo Nation may not impose tribal regulation on the operation of FCPP. DEIS at 4.8-3, 4.5-4. OSM then states that it may not rely on tribal water quality standards or tribally listed endangered species to assess the environmental impacts of the DEIS alternatives. Id. However, the DEIS then contradicts itself by stating “[t]he Navajo Mine and FCPP are located on the Navajo sovereign tribal land; therefore, air emissions and air quality are under the jurisdiction of the Navajo Nation Environmental Protection Agency (“NNEPA”) and overseen by the EPA Region IX in San Francisco.” DEIS at 4.1-1. The DEIS attempts to explain this contradiction by	The EIS utilizes and discloses tribal environmental standards where applicable within the Regulatory Framework subsection of each resource category, including 4.1-4, 4.5-4, and 4.8-3, in accordance with NEPA requirements. Table 1-1 also includes regulatory actions and roles of the Navajo Nation and Hopi Tribe. Further, Section 4.5.4 of the EIS states that “The analysis of potential impacts to water quality is based on a comparison of water quality monitoring data at the FCPP and Navajo Mine Lease Area to NNEPA standards. These standards although not applicable to the FCPP, provide a consistent metric against which to evaluate potential changes to water quality as a result of the project alternatives. Further, the NPDES permit includes monitoring for some constituents for which NNEPA standards exist; these permit limits match

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p>stating: “In 2005, the NNEPA and owners of the FCPP entered into a Voluntary Compliance Agreement that resolves jurisdictional authority dispute and states that the administration and enforcement of the NNEPA permit cannot be more stringent than EPA limits and federal court decisions; thereby, limiting the tribe’s ability to enforce more stringent limits than that established by the EPA.” DEIS at 4.1-1, fnt. 1.</p> <p>The Conservation Groups reject the notion that OSM may ignore tribal environmental standards for purposes of this NEPA process. The Navajo Nation has set environmental standards that have universal applicability on the reservation. OSM has a duty to consider compliance with all such tribal environmental standards in conducting its NEPA assessment. More specifically, NEPA regulations impose a duty on OSM to consider “[p]ossible conflicts between the proposed action and the objectives of Federal, regional, State, and local (and in the case of a reservation, Indian tribe) land use plans, policies and controls for the area concerned. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.16(c) (emphasis added); see also 40 C.F.R. § 1506.2(d). OSM’s failure to assess compliance with tribal water quality standards, endangered species regulations, and other tribal environmental standards violated the regulatory requirements of NEPA.</p>	the NNEPA standards.” See Master Response #11 related to Covenant 17.
307.009	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>Furthermore, even assuming, arguendo, that the Navajo Nation’s water quality or other protective standards cannot be enforced against the FCPP, this does not obviate OSM’s procedural obligation, in accord with NEPA, to take a hard look at environmental impacts relative to those standards. Given that such standards are presumably designed to actually protect water quality—including use of that water for, e.g., swimming, fishing, agriculture, and aquatic wildlife—these standards provide critical benchmarks for gauging the acceptability of coal operations to guide the development of mitigation measures and to ensure that OSM’s choice of action is reasoned and informed. Indeed, by not providing this analysis, OSM’s DEIS strongly suggests that there is something to hide regarding impacts.</p>	Figure 4.5-8 provides a comparison of Morgan Lake surface water quality sampling to Navajo Nation standards for those constituents that were detected. Figure 4.5-9 compares water quality monitoring data in Chaco River upstream and downstream of the FCPP to Navajo Nation standards, and has been updated to include more recent monitoring data. A discussion of these results is provided on pages 4.5-33 and 4.5-34 of the Draft EIS. As shown on Figure 4.5-8, the concentration of constituents were at or below the Navajo Nation standard for all constituents, with the exception of one data point for aluminum which exceeds the chronic standard for aquatic habitat. Based on these data, OSMRE’s analysis concludes on page 4.5-57 that “continued operations regarding uptake and discharge of water from Morgan Lake would not adversely affect surface water quality of water bodies in the vicinity of the plant.”
307.010	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>The Conservation Groups also object to the attempt by the Navajo Nation and the owners of the APS to prevent OSM from applying tribal standards through a series of contractual agreements. The owners of the FCPP should not be able to “pick and choose” the tribal environmental standards with which it wishes to comply. Instead, the FCPP is subject to the same generally applicable tribal environmental standards as all other parties. OSM’s uncritical acceptance of this scheme to allow the largest polluter on the Navajo Nation to contractually avoid compliance with tribal environmental law is arbitrary, capricious, unconstitutional, and a violation of the NEPA regulations. OSM must, at the least, provide a critical analysis explaining why this scheme is legally permissible. OSM must also, regardless, re-issue the DEIS for public comment after conducting a full and complete analysis of whether the DEIS alternatives</p>	The EIS utilizes and discloses tribal environmental standards where applicable within the Regulatory Framework subsection of each resource category, in accordance with NEPA requirements. See Response 307.008 and 307.009 for a discussion of OSMRE’s use of “tribal environmental standards as benchmarks.” See Master Response #6 Recirculating the Draft EIS and Master Response #11 related to Covenant 17.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						will comply with federal, state, local, and generally applicable tribal environmental laws and, independently, take a hard look at impacts by using tribal environmental standards as benchmarks to guide the development of mitigation measures and to ensure that OSM's choice of action is reasoned and informed.	
307.011	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	The Project DEIS that OSM has prepared does not meet NEPA's requirements. First, instead of illustrating that "OSM carefully consider[ed] information about significant environmental impacts," it reveals that OSM failed to take a hard look at the impacts of continued operation of the Navajo Mine and FCPP for an additional 25 years. OSM's analysis is deficient in several respects. OSM improperly defined the baseline, and thus discounts significant impacts. OSM failed to take a hard look at impacts of the Project on climate change, public health, water resources, air quality, coal combustion waste, endangered species, and environmental justice, trust assets, cultural resources, and cumulative impacts.	With regard to taking a "hard look" in general, please see Master response #1. The EIS provides a comprehensive and detailed analysis for all resource areas and technical issues raised in scoping. The technical methodologies employed for each resource area relied upon best available information and quantified potential effects. Specific reasoning for how each resource takes a "hard look" at issues is discussed in the responses below. In regards to cumulative effects, the baseline accounts for the past 50 years of FCPP/Navajo Mine operations; see Master Response 14. In many instances, prior operations have influenced the quality and characteristic of the existing environment and those effects are captured in the existing environment characterization. For example, Section 4.15.2.1 discusses historic CCR placement in Navajo Mine as part of the Affected Environment.
307.012	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	Finally, OSM also failed to "guarantee relevant information is available to the public." Northern Plains Resource Council, 668 F.3d 1067, 1072. Not only does the EIS fail to provide sufficient information as noted, OSM's public participation process has been lacking: OSM has not allowed sufficient time for review of the Project DEIS, and public meetings were lacking in both information and a process by which to ensure that the public was welcomed, could provide information, and have questions about the Project DEIS answered.	Please see Master Response #8, Draft EIS Comment Period Was Too Short. OSMRE extended the comment period by 30 days in order to provide additional time for the public to review the EIS and provide comments. In total, the public was given 91 days from March 28 to June 27, 2014 to review and comment on the Draft EIS. This public comment window is effectively double the length of time provided in the OSMRE NEPA Handbook (Section 2.E.3.n). In response to the claim that the public forum was not adequate, please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format.
307.013	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	OSM quotes from the CEQ guidance on establishing a proper baseline, but then completely ignore that guidance in the DEIS.	Please see Master Response #14, No Action Alternative and Environmental Baseline
307.014	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	Despite CEQ's admonishment in its guidance – as reinforced by the definition of "cumulative effects" – that federal agencies not discount the "cumulative impacts of past and present actions or limiting assessment to the Proposed Action and future actions," as well as CEQ's regulations themselves, OSM proceeds to do just that. OSM asserts that two completed actions – and these actions' past, present, and reasonably foreseeable impacts – constitute part of the baseline, including the BART determination, and the Navajo Mine transfer. DEIS at 4-1. As a result of this definition of the baseline, OSM fails to take a hard look at the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts caused by continued operation of the Navajo Mine and FCPP.	With regard to taking a "hard look" in general, please see Master Response #1. The EIS provides a comprehensive and detailed analysis for all resource areas and technical issues raised in scoping. The furthest extent, the technical methodologies employed for each resource area relied upon best available information and quantified potential effects. Specific reasoning for how each resource takes a "hard look" at issues are discussed in the responses below. In regards to cumulative effects, the baseline accounts for the past 50 years of FCPP/Navajo Mine operations. In many instances, prior operations have influenced the quality and characteristic of the existing environment and those effects are captured in the existing environment characterization. For example, Section 4.15.2.1 discusses historic CCR placement in Navajo Mine as part of the Affected Environment. The BART determination and the Navajo Mine transfer are analyzed in this EIS; however, by acknowledging the changes from these federal actions in the environmental baseline, the Draft EIS avoids attributing beneficial

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							impacts (e.g., reduced air emissions) to the Action alternatives, See Master Comment #14.
307.015						<p>First, to reiterate a point made above, OSM’s so-called “baseline” operates to obscure and hide the true scope, magnitude, and long-term consequences of coal operations. For example, there is an obvious and significant difference between 50 years of mercury deposition caused by coal-fired power plant combustion and 75 years of mercury deposition caused by coal-fired power plant combustion, even if the last 25 years is anticipated to result in marginally less deposition than the first 50 years. In this light, reducing suffering caused by impacts from the mine and power plant may be welcomed, but reduction of impacts neither eliminates impacts nor does it address past and cumulative impacts. Thus, OSM must take a hard look at the true extent of that suffering and the true extent of the impacts causing that suffering by taking a hard look at past, present, and future impacts in the aggregate, to identify where impacts are additive or synergistic, and to calibrate alternatives and mitigation measures accordingly. It is only when OSM is armed with such a “hard look” environmental review that it can provide itself a basis for determining whether coal operations should continue beyond 2015.</p>	<p>Master Response #14 in part addresses this question. The effects of past operations are fully addressed in the EIS, in part through the description of the environmental setting. The setting includes two clearly differentiated discussions: the first is of the past 50 years of operations at full capacity, and the second is operations from 2014 to 2018, the transition period within which the compliance actions with the EPA’s FIP for BART would be implemented. Public health is explicitly addressed in this way, including site specific data (soil, water, and air), as well as regional studies conducted by government agencies. With regard to mercury deposition, regional surface water quality conditions, which account for historic, ongoing power plant emissions, are described in Section 4.5.2.2; the results of site-specific soil data are addressed in public health and ecological risk assessment; potential impacts of mercury deposition on fish species within the San Juan Basin waterway is discussed on Page 4.8-69.</p> <p>The cumulative impact assessment, which addresses the cumulative impacts of past, present, and reasonably-foreseeable future actions, explicitly brings the historic perspective to bear. This is also carried through the environmental justice analysis.</p>
307.016						<p>Second, with its inclusion of the BART determination as part of the baseline, OSM ignores the past 50 years of operation of Navajo Mine and FCPP.</p> <p>On December 31, 2013, APS ceased operation of Units 1-3. This DEIS was issued for public comment in March 2014. Despite the fact that Units 1-3 had been in continuous operation for nearly 50 years from the late 1960s through all of 2013, OSM considers the cessation of operations of Units 1-3 to be the baseline for the FCPP. Units 1-3 were in operation when this NEPA process was commenced. Units 1-3 were in operation when OSM elicited scoping comments from the public. At the time OSM issued its DEIS, Units 1-3 had been dormant for only 2 months. Nevertheless, OSM ignores the nearly 50 years of operation of units 1-3—and those units’ attendant impacts—and instead claims that 2 months of dormancy at these units represents the baseline. With this conceit, OSM sweeps the prior 50 years of operations under the rug, effectively concluding that continued coal operations to provide 1500-MW of power are a benefit to the environment. This conclusion is absurd; while coal impacts moving forward may be less, that does not mean they provide a benefit to the environment, or that impacts are minor or insignificant and thus do not require serious mitigation or a serious evaluation regarding the propriety of authorizing another 25 years of coal operations.</p>	<p>See Master Response #14, Baseline. As described in the introduction to Chapter 4, Approach to Environmental Analysis, there have been two completed federal actions that may affect the continuing operations at FCPP, and at Navajo Mine. At FCPP, the EPA has made its ruling with respect to BART to control air emissions. For Navajo Mine, OSMRE has approved the SMCRA permit transfer from BNCC to NTEC (Section 2.4.1). These completed federal actions form part of the environmental baseline to which the effects of continuing operations and the Proposed Actions are compared.</p> <p>However, in each description of the environmental setting, the measured current conditions (prior to 2014) are described first; this includes the 50 years of prior operations, and describes the baseline that most people in the vicinity of the project experience. This description is followed by the expected conditions as a result of BART compliance or as a result of the SMCRA (interim period: 2014-2018) permit transfer. Environmental consequences are then determined relative to this baseline condition.</p> <p>This approach does not ascribe any environmental benefits to the project. In contrast, the benefits of these two completed actions are simply described as part of the environmental setting, specifically in that part of the setting that describes the “interim period” during which the FIP for BART is implemented.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
307.017	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	The CEQ NEPA Regulations direct federal agencies to “commence[] its NEPA process at the earliest time possible.” 40 C.F.R. § 1501.2(d)(3). More specifically, “[f]or applications to the agency appropriate environmental assessments or statements shall be commenced no later than immediately after the application is received.” 40 C.F.R. § 1502.5(b). It appears that OSM intentionally delayed issuance of the DEIS until after December 30, 2013, to claim that FCPP’s retirement of Units 1-3 could be considered part of the baseline for the project. To help clarify OSM’s action, OSM should clearly state—and support with evidence in the record—when OSM initially received an application from APS, BHP, or the Navajo Nation to commence the NEPA process. Alternatively, if this NEPA process was initiated by OSM, OSM should state the date that this NEPA process was initiated, and under what basis. OSM should also include all documents supporting or involving the commencement of this NEPA process into the administrative record for this proceeding. Further, OSM should include in the administrative record any and all communications discussing the issuance of the DEIS after December 30, 2013 or the cessation of operations of Units 1-3.	As demonstrated by the project timeline and administrative record, the EIS process was initiated in July 2013 and the final BART decision was published August 2013, during the scoping period. As such, the Draft EIS baseline reflects the requirement of implementing this decision (which required either shut-down of Units 1, 2, and 3 or installation of emissions controls on all five units in order to meet specific thresholds). The timing of this implementation had no bearing on the date of issuance of the Draft EIS or its contents.
307.018	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	As discussed in more detail throughout these comments, by sweeping the 50 years of coal mining and combustion at the FCPP and Navajo mine complex under the rug, OSM purports to improperly “focus the environmental impacts assessment too narrowly,” and “overlook impacts of past and present actions.” CEQ Guidance, quoted at DEIS at 4-1; 40 C.F.R. § 1508.7. Nowhere does the DEIS take a proper hard look at the past impacts from coal mining, coal combustion, or coal ash disposal. Thus, OSM completely disregards the significant degradation caused by Navajo Mine and FCPP over the last 50 years, and limits its concerns about impacts to the 25 years of future operation, as if it were operating on a clean slate. See, e.g., DEIS at 4.5-41 (discounting water quality issues: “Information on existing water resources was used as the baseline to measure and identify potential impacts from the Proposed Action and alternatives.”); DEIS at 4.5-45 (discounting increased pollution as within the variation of “baseline” wells); DEIS at 4.5-59 (discounting continued deposition of toxics to waterways due to relative impacts: “Therefore, while mercury and selenium would continue to be deposited into the San Juan River watershed, surface water quality impacts would be minor compared to baseline conditions.”); DEIS at 4.7-30 (discounting impacts to wildlife from continued operation merely because they are not an increase over “baseline”).	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis and Master Response #14, Baseline, and response 307.019. In order to further clarify how the EIS analyzes the consequences of historic operations as it pertains to Section 4.5 Water Resources/Hydrology the following text has been added to page 4.5-1: The discussion incorporates the effects of the past 50 years of operations of the FCPP and the Navajo Mine on water resources through comparison of current conditions to water quality standards; current best management practices; historic data collected prior to FCPP and/or Navajo Mine operations; and hydrologic data collected upgradient and/or upstream of FCPP and/or Navajo Mine operations.
307.019						While it is certainly a good thing that surface water quality impacts from coal operations over the course of the next 25 years will be less (we reject OSM’s subjective use of “minor,” in particular given its failure, detailed above, to use Navajo Nation water quality standards as a benchmark for analysis) than operations over the preceding 50 years, OSM must take a hard look at the full 75 years of coal operation impacts, in particular to gauge whether these impacts are additive (e.g., 25 years	With regard to using Navajo Nation water quality standards see Responses 307.008, 307.009, and 307.010: Figure 4.5-8 provides a comparison of Morgan Lake surface water quality sampling to Navajo Nation standards for those constituents that were detected. Figure 4.5-9 compares water quality monitoring data in Chaco River upstream and downstream of the FCPP to Navajo Nation standards. A discussion of these results is provided on pages 4.5-33 and 4.5-34 of the Draft EIS. As

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						of impacts + 50 years of impacts=cumulative impact) or synergistic (e.g., 50 years of impacts x 25 years of impacts=cumulative impact) given their persistence.	shown on Figure 4.5-8, the concentration of constituents were at or below the Navajo Nation standard for all constituents, with the exception of one data point for aluminum which exceeds the chronic standard for aquatic habitat. Based on these data, OSMRE's analysis concludes on page 4.5-57 that "continued operations regarding uptake and discharge of water from Morgan Lake would not adversely affect surface water quality of water bodies in the vicinity of the plant." With regard to taking a hard look at the full 75 years of operation, please see Master Response #14, Baseline and Response 307.018. As described, the analysis considers the potential impact of another 25 years of operation in addition to the baseline conditions that are present and account for the past 50 years. With regard to the use of "Minor", CEQ regulations require that NEPA analyses discuss the magnitude and duration of impacts; OSMRE NEPA Handbook page 2-31 specifically directs OSMRE to "characterize impact levels, i.e., negligible, minor, moderate, major or low, medium, high, etc." Based on the data presented and comparison to Navajo Nation water quality standards, the conclusion matches the significance criteria presented in Section 4.5.4. Changes would affect the quantity or quality but not the use of water or are similar to those caused by random fluctuations in natural processes.
307.020	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>Including the mine transfer as part of the baseline presents additional problems. OSM seems to assume that because it has included that transfer as part of the baseline, that it need not consider numerous aspects of the Project, instead claiming that those impacts were addressed in the Environmental Assessment for the transfer. (See, e.g., Videos of Public Meeting (available at: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p_5wBhTi4-k&amp;feature=youtu.be">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p_5wBhTi4-k&amp;feature=youtu.be</a>, and <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BOJBhqUk9Ag">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BOJBhqUk9Ag</a> (last accessed June 26, 2014)).) However, the Navajo Mine Transfer EA specifically states that it does not address impacts beyond 2016:</p> <p>This EA considers implications of the permit and lease transfers through the end of the current coal supply agreement, July 2016 (OSM 2012b). Proposed Navajo Mine operations beyond the life of the coal supply agreement would be analyzed in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) currently being prepared by OSM (OSM 2012c). (OSM, Environmental Assessment, Navajo Mine SMCRA Permit NM-0003F Transfer, 2 (November 2013) (attached as Exhibit 11); OSM, Finding of No Significant Impact, Navajo Mine SMCRA Permit NM-0003F Transfer, (November 2013) (attached as Exhibit 12); see also Letter from Pearl Chamberlin, Acting Regional Director, United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Navajo Region, to Charles Roybal, BHP Navajo Coal Company, May 10, 2013 (attached as Exhibit 13); Letter from Pat Risner, President, BHP Navajo Coal Company and Harrison Tsosie, Attorney General, Navajo Nation to Sharon Pinto, Regional Director, United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, May 15, 2013 (attached as Exhibit 14).)</p>	Please see Master Response #14, Baseline and Master Response #7, Mine Transfer EA.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p>Moreover, the Navajo Mine Transfer EA never conducted a comprehensive analysis of the mine’s full history of impacts—i.e., the cumulative impacts caused by 50 years of coal mining— and certainly did not consider those impacts relative to the context and intensity of connected and cumulative coal-fired combustion operations. As the DEIS only addresses impacts beyond 2016, OSM cannot point to the transfer EA as a proxy for analysis of post-2016 impacts.</p> <p>Instead, as explained by the Conservation Groups, OSM should have discussed the transfer and the Proposed Action in a single EIS, partly to avoid the absurd consequences now apparent in the DEIS. (See Exhibits 3-7.) Furthermore, OSM should have taken a comprehensive hard look at the mine’s historic impacts – impacts caused by 50 years of coal mining and coal ash waste disposal. As they have engineered it, BIA and OSM never fulfill their responsibilities to comprehensively assess the environmental and financial implications of the mine transfer (and underlying mine operations at the heart of that transfer) and the changing status of the Navajo Nation from Cooperating Agency role to project proponent (with a financial stake in the perpetuation of the Navajo Mine and FCPP. OSM thus acts arbitrarily and capricious when it segments connected and cumulative actions and consequently fails to address the significant environmental and financial implications of the transfer</p>	
307.021	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>Even if these actions are somehow deemed neither connected nor cumulative, OSM still, as discussed below, has an independent duty to address indirect and cumulative impacts, in particular where impacts were not addressed in prior environmental reviews. 40 C.F.R. §§ 1508.7, 1508.8(b). OSM’s transfer EA delimited the temporal scope of its assessment to only impacts occurring through the life of the permit—i.e., the end of 2015. Yet the indirect consequence of the transfer was to continue the Navajo mine’s operations and, therefore, to set the stage – i.e., create indirect impacts from – mine and power plant operations to continue in 2016 and beyond. Moreover, the impacts of continued mine operations – whether pre-transfer, or during the time period assessed by the Navajo mine transfer EA, when combined with impacts caused by post-2016 operations, cause cumulative impacts.</p>	Please see Master Response #7, Mine Transfer EA, #14, No Action Alternative and Environmental Baseline. Cumulative impacts are addressed in Section 4.18 of the EIS.
307.022	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>OSM’s DEIS should have fully analyzed the implications of the Navajo Mine transaction, including evaluation of due diligence reports and full analysis of financial information concerning continued operations of FCPP and Navajo Mine. (The Navajo Nation spent approximately \$3 million on the preparation of a due diligence assessing the risks and liabilities associated with the purchase of the Navajo mine from BHP. Navajo Nation Press Release Discussing Due Diligence Report (attached as Exhibit 15). This due diligence report has never been released to the public, despite requests from Diné C.A.R.E. See Open File Request to Navajo Nation from Diné C.A.R.E. (April 29, 2014) (attached as Exhibit 16). The DEIS should have included the Due Diligence Report as an appendix to the DEIS because it contains valuable information on</p>	See Master Response #7 for an explanation regarding the Navajo Mine Permit Transfer EA relationship to the Draft EIS. With regard to the request for the due diligence documents, these are developed as part of a transaction to inform business decisions, therefore, such documentation is not a part of the Proposed Project evaluated in the Draft EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						potential environmental, economic and human health risks and impacts. Such information is directly relevant to a NEPA analysis of the impacts of continued operation of the mine for an additional 25 years. We ask that the due diligence report and all related information be released to the public as a component of the DEIS and that the public be given an adequate amount of time to review and comment on the report and related information as part of the DEIS public comment process.) Ideally, this would be done in a single EIS, but OSM's decision to separate out these various projects, even if somehow permissible in accord with NEPA, does not obviate the agency's duty, if it prepares multiple NEPA analyses, to take a hard look at past, present, and cumulative impacts caused by pre-2016 mining operations, pre-2016 coal-fired power plant operations, and pre-2016 coal combustion waste disposal impacts, in conjunction with post-2016 mine, power plant, and coal combustion waste impacts. We would note that the inclusion of the SMCRA permit in the DEIS as part of the Proposed Action makes the assigning of transfer liabilities (that can only be understood relative to a comprehensive assessment of impacts) and assets, defining of ownership and regulatory requirements, and the responsibility of the Federal government even more important to consider in the context of a true hard look NEPA review, which this DEIS is not.	
307.023	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	Despite the urgent need for action called for by the Climate Assessment, the numerous IPCC reports, and scientists worldwide, and despite the significant GHG emissions from FCPP that will continue for 25 years if the Proposed Action goes forward, OSM amazingly concludes that "while the Proposed Action would contribute to the effects of climate change, its contribution relative to other sources would be minor in the short- and long-term." DEIS at 4.2-23. In short, OSM is stating that 258.5 million metric tons of CO2e does not need to be addressed because relative to total GHG emissions, the emissions are minor. What OSM's absurd argument fails to recognize is that all GHG pollution relative to total emissions is minor. Climate change is a death by a thousand cuts; there is no one source that if shut down will solve the problem. There are few individual sources, however, that contribute to climate change as much as coal-fired power plants. As the President's Climate Action Plans acknowledges, given that one third of U.S. GHG emissions come from power plants, they are a good place to start. OSM, however, even dismisses a third of our nation's GHG emissions, stating: "Electrical power generation accounts for just 34 percent of GHG emissions nationwide." DEIS at 4.2-23 (emphasis added). This blasé attitude reveals the root problem with OSM's argument: if taken to its logical conclusion, OSM would have us all sit on our hands, as any effort to reduce GHG emissions, by OSM's standards, could be brushed aside as minor.	The Draft EIS acknowledges projected impacts of climate change and includes an extensive analysis of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) emissions from FCPP. The emissions data are presented in a straightforward way, neither minimizing nor exaggerating global warming potential from FCPP. The conclusion that FCPP contribution relative to other sources is minor is consistent with the impact analysis methodology employed throughout the EIS, and the methodology presented in Section 4.2. This is also consistent with the Draft Guidance published by EPA in December 2014.  The Final EIS was modified to address that in June 2014, EPA issued the "Clean Power Plan" proposal to cut carbon pollution from existing power plants. The EIS was changed to acknowledge the proposed plan; however, because of the uncertainties associated with the proposed plan and the proposed time frames, there is no change to the conclusions or analysis in the EIS.

307.024	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	<p>06/27/14</p> <p>Not only is OSM’s approach ridiculous, it is also illegal. NEPA does not allow an agency to sweep significant impacts under the rug without first taking a hard look at the impacts, including impacts from climate change. An agency must “consider every significant aspect of the environmental impact of a proposed action.” Baltimore Gas &amp; Elec. Co., 462 U.S. at 107 (quotations and citation omitted). To fulfill this mandate, agencies must disclose the “ecological[,] . . . economic, [and] social” impacts of a proposed action. 40 C.F.R. § 1508.8(b). It is well settled that where an agency action causes greenhouse gas pollution, NEPA mandates that agencies analyze and disclose the impacts of that pollution. As the Ninth Circuit has held: [T]he fact that climate change is largely a global phenomenon that includes actions that are outside of [the agency’s] control ... does not release the agency from the duty of assessing the effects of its actions on global warming within the context of other actions that also affect global warming. <i>Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Nat’l Highway Traffic Safety Admin.</i>, 538 F.3d 1172, 1217 (9th Cir. 2008) (quotations and citations omitted); see also <i>Border Power Plant Working Grp. v. U.S. Dep’t of Energy</i>, 260 F. Supp. 2d 997, 1028-29 (S.D. Cal. 2003). The need to evaluate such impacts is bolstered by the fact that “[t]he harms associated with climate change are serious and well recognized,” and environmental changes caused by climate change “have already inflicted significant harms” to many resources around the globe. <i>Massachusetts v. EPA</i>, 549 U.S. 497, 521 (2007); see also <i>id.</i> at 525 (recognizing “the enormity of the potential consequences associated with manmade climate change.”).</p> <p>The EIS must “discuss the actual environmental effects resulting from [the proposed action’s] emissions.” <i>Ctr. for Biological Diversity</i>, 538 F.3d at 1216. As we noted in our scoping comments, CEQ has come out with draft guidance for agencies for evaluating climate change Impacts (See CEQ, Draft NEPA Guidance on Consideration of the Effects of Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Feb. 2010) (hereinafter CEQ, Draft Guidance) (attached to Conservation Groups’ Scoping Comments as Exhibit 62). CEQ’s guidance provides that, as a general rule, an agency should consider a project’s GHG emissions if they exceed 25,000 metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>-equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e). CEQ, Draft Guidance at 3. An agency should consider “direct and indirect GHG emissions,” and where they are significant (i.e., greater than 25,000 tons CO<sub>2</sub>e), they should be “quantified and disclosed,” taking “account of all phases and elements of the proposed action over its expected life.” <i>Id.</i> At 5; 40 C.F.R. §§ 1508.25(c)(1)-(3). CEQ’s Guidance counsels: “In the agency’s analysis of direct effects, it would be appropriate to: (1) quantify cumulative emissions over the life of the project; (2) discuss measures to reduce GHG emissions, including consideration of reasonable alternatives; and (3) qualitatively discuss the link between such GHG emissions and climate change.” CEQ, Draft Guidance at 3.</p> <p>OSM’s quantification of emissions – although a step in the right direction – and cursory discussion of the issue of climate change, do not constitute the required hard look of the issue and the Project’s contribution to the problem compelled by NEPA. As discussed above, the Project’s</p>	<p>Please see Master Responses #1, Deficient Analysis, and #5, Climate Change. The EIS includes a robust analysis of climate change and the FCPP and Navajo Mine’s global warming potential, consistent with CEQ guidance. The conclusion that climate change impacts are minor relative to other sources is consistent with the impact analysis methodology employed throughout the EIS.</p>
---------	-----	-------	----------	------	---	---

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						contribution is not, as OSM would like to believe, insignificant or minor. OSM's conclusion that the Proposed Action "would not result in a major contribution to adverse effects associated with climate change," and [t]herefore, no additional mitigation is recommended," DEIS at 4.2-24, flies in the face of CEQ guidance directing that mitigation be addressed when emissions are over 25,000 tons CO <sub>2</sub> e annually. When direct and indirect GHG emissions exceed the relevant threshold, 25,000 tons CO <sub>2</sub> e, the agency should also consider "mitigation measures and reasonable alternatives to reduce action-related GHG emissions." CEQ, Draft Guidance at 3. Here, emissions will be well over 400 times CEQ's threshold for considering "mitigation measures and reasonable alternatives." Contrary to the Conservations Groups' recommendations in scoping comments, OSM has failed to include any alternatives that provide for meaningful comparison amongst impacts. Furthermore, OSM's forthright statement that it will not consider mitigation measures demonstrates that instead of taking a hard look at impacts, OSM is merely stating that there will not be any, and therefore further analysis is unnecessary.	
307.025	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	Moreover, as the DEIS meekly admits: "Due to the area's aridity, climate change could have a substantial impact if the already low precipitation amounts decrease in the future (NM 2005)." DEIS at 4.1-16. Given these two facts, OSM's failure to consider the Project's contribution to climate change and the impacts already being felt in the Southwest is unsupported.	See Master Response #5 Climate Change. The EIS includes an analysis of baseline conditions relative to climate change. The EIS addresses regional contributions to climate change from 17 electric power-generating facilities in the Four Corners region (northeastern Arizona, southwestern Colorado, Navajo Nation, and northwestern New Mexico) within a distance of 400 km (248 miles), including FCPP and SJGS that report to Federal and tribal EPAs pursuant to Part 75 (Table 4.2-4). Section 4.2 has additionally been expanded to discuss the social impacts of climate change. The impact of climate change on other resources is addressed in the cumulative impacts section 4.18 of the EIS.
307.026	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	Given what is known about the association of burning coal and climate change impacts, the DEIS must take a hard look at the impacts of continued operation of the Navajo Mine and FCPP in conjunction with global and national emissions trends—and climate change impact forecasts for the region—to take the requisite hard look at direct, indirect, and cumulative climate change impacts.	See Master Response #5 Climate Change. The EIS includes a robust analysis of climate change and the FCPP and Navajo Mine's global warming potential. The EIS addresses regional contributions to climate change from 17 electric power-generating facilities in the Four Corners region (northeastern Arizona, southwestern Colorado, Navajo Nation, and northwestern New Mexico) within a distance of 400 km (248 miles), including FCPP that report to Federal and tribal EPAs pursuant to Part 75 (Table 4.2-4). See Section 4.2.2.7, Regional and State GHG Emissions.
307.027	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	OSM also attempts to avoid analysis of climate change by asserting: "at present no regulatory mechanism exists for assessing the significance of the GHG emissions," and that "the regulatory framework does not support quantification of [the societal] costs." DEIS at 4.2-23. The Project DEIS's claims of impossibility are flatly contradicted by the fact that a standardized federal agency protocol – the social cost of carbon – does exist, and was specifically developed to estimate the social, economic, and ecological impacts of greenhouse gas pollution. The federal social cost of carbon is an estimate of the incremental dollar value of damages associated with an incremental increase in greenhouse gas	With respect to including the social cost of carbon for the Project, NEPA does not require a cost-benefit analysis, although CEQ NEPA regulations allow agencies to use it in NEPA analyses in certain circumstances (40 CFR § 1502.23). The CEQ regulation states (in part), "...for the purposes of complying with the Act, the weighing of the merits and drawbacks of various alternatives need not be displayed in a monetary cost-benefit analysis and should not be when there are important qualitative considerations."

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p>pollution. It is intended to include changes in net agricultural productivity, human health, property damages, and the value of ecosystem services, all of which climate change can degrade (Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, Technical Support Document (May 2013) (attached as Exhibit 23) at 1; see also Cass R. Sunstein, <i>The Real World of Cost-Benefit Analysis: Thirty-Six Questions (and Almost as Many Answers)</i>, 114 Colum. L. Rev. 167, 171-73 (Jan. 2014) (describing origins of interagency agreement on the social cost of carbon). A dozen departments and agencies developed the protocol in 2010 to effectively measure the costs and benefits of proposed regulations, as required by Executive Order 12866 (Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, Technical Support Document (Feb. 2010) at 1-3 (attached as Exhibit 24). Federal agencies that developed and endorsed the protocol included: the Council on Environmental Quality (which oversees NEPA compliance); the Department of Agriculture; and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) (which regulates greenhouse gas emissions). The federal social cost of carbon was developed through a robust process that included “[t]echnical experts from numerous agencies [meeting] on a regular basis to consider public comments, explore the technical literature in relevant fields, and discuss key model inputs and assumptions.” Id. at 1.). The social cost of carbon thus permits decision-makers to address, and the public to understand, the broad benefits of reducing carbon emissions, or the costs of increasing emissions, in analyses of actions that may have small, or “marginal,” impacts on cumulative global emissions (Id. at 1.). Agencies have routinely used the social cost of carbon protocols to achieve these goals when evaluating the costs and benefits of rulemakings, and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has recommended that other agencies use the protocol in NEPA reviews. (For example, EPA, the Department of Transportation and the Department of Energy have utilized the Interagency Working Group’s approach in rulemakings. See, e.g., EPA and National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, <i>Final Rule, 2017 and Later Model Year Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i>, 77 Fed. Reg. 62,624, 63,004-06 (Oct. 15, 2012); Department of Energy, <i>Final Rule, Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Standby Mode and Off Mode for Microwave Ovens</i>, 78 Fed. Reg. 36,316; 36,349-52; 36,363-64 (June 17, 2013) (explaining basis for social cost of carbon analysis and identifying range of benefits from reducing energy use of appliances). EPA has recommended that other federal agencies use the Interagency Working Group’s approach in NEPA documents. See Sarah E. Light, <i>NEPA’s Footprint: Information Disclosure as a Quasi-Carbon Tax on Agencies</i>, 87 Tul. L. Rev. 511, 545-46 &amp; n.160 (Feb. 2013) (describing EPA recommendation that State Department, in evaluating impacts of Keystone XL Pipeline, “explore ... means to characterize the impact of the GHG emissions, including an estimate of the ‘social cost of carbon’ associated with potential increases of GHG emissions.”).</p>	<p>The Interagency Working Group (IWG) of federal agencies was convened in order to facilitate compliance with Executive Order 12866, which requires that agencies recognize costs and benefits of regulatory rulemaking, including the Social Cost of Carbon (SCC). The IWG developed a technical approach for monetizing the potential social cost from cumulative global emissions when developing regulation. The FCCP and Navajo Mine Energy Project EIS is not being prepared to support the promulgation of a regulation, but to inform the agencies’ decisions whether or not to approve certain operating permits, lease amendments and right-of-way renewals.</p> <p>A quantitative analysis of the SCC has been added to the Final EIS in Section 4.2. The Draft EIS considered the SCC in a qualitative manner, but did not quantify the effects. Subsequent to issuance of the Draft EIS, CEQ published Draft Guidance on climate change analysis (CEQ 2014), in which CEQ indicates that emissions monetization is not required in every project-level NEPA analysis. Nonetheless, OSMRE determined that a quantitative analysis would be included in the Final EIS, following the Interagency Working Group Methods. The results of the SCC analysis do not change the conclusions or the findings of level of significance for the Climate Change issue; however, the analysis has been added to provide additional context to OSMRE’s decision.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
307.028	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	Indeed, in an opinion issued just today in the U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado, Judge Jackson lambasted the Forest Service for attempting to avoid quantifying these costs when a tool to do so is available: “a tool is and was available: the social cost of carbon protocol.” <i>High Country Conservation Advocates v. U.S. Forest Service</i> , Docket no. 1:13-cv-01723-RBJ, slip op. at 17 (June 27, 2014). Thus, Judge Jackson concluded: “even though NEPA does not require a cost-benefit analysis, it was nonetheless arbitrary and capricious to quantify the benefits of the lease modification and then explain that a similar analysis of the costs was impossible when such an analysis was in fact possible.”	<p>With respect to including the social cost of carbon protocol for the Project. The Interagency Working Group (IWG) of federal agencies was convened in order to facilitate compliance with Executive Order 12866, which requires that agencies recognize costs and benefits of regulatory rulemaking, including the Social Cost of Carbon (SCC). The IWG developed a technical approach for monetizing the potential social cost from cumulative global emissions when developing regulation. The FCCP and Navajo Mine Energy Project EIS is not being prepared to support the promulgation of a regulation, but to inform the agencies’ decisions whether or not to approve certain operating permits, lease amendments and right-of-way renewals.</p> <p>A quantitative analysis of the SCC has been added to the Final EIS in Section 4.2. The Draft EIS considered the SCC in a qualitative manner, but did not quantify the effects. Subsequent to issuance of the Draft EIS, CEQ published Draft Guidance on climate change analysis (CEQ 2014), in which CEQ indicates that emissions monetization is not required in every project-level NEPA analysis. Nonetheless, OSMRE determined that a quantitative analysis would be included in the Final EIS, following the Interagency Working Group Methods. The results of the SCC analysis do not change the conclusions or the findings of level of significance for the Climate Change issue; however, the analysis has been added to provide additional context to OSMRE’s decision.</p>
307.029	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	However, OSM’s analysis arbitrarily assumes a price of carbon that is \$0 by failing to consider externalized costs altogether, such as human health and environmental degradation, thus stacking the deck in favor of perpetuating the mine and power plant. Moreover, the DEIS has failed to meaningfully contemplate a transition to renewable energy generation, not only as an alternative which may eventually suppress demand for the power from FCCP and consequently the coal from Navajo Mine, but also, as suggested above, as a reasonable and alternative pathway toward mitigating climate change as it relates to agency decision-making on federal lands (See, e.g., United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Renewable Energy Sources and Climate Change Mitigation (2012) (attached as Exhibit 28).	<p>With regard to alternatives to coal, please see Master Response #2, Alternatives.</p> <p>With respect to including externalized costs for the Project. NEPA does not require a cost-benefit analysis, although CEQ NEPA regulations allow agencies to use it in NEPA analyses in certain circumstances (40 CFR § 1502.23). The CEQ regulation states (in part), “...for the purposes of complying with the Act, the weighing of the merits and drawbacks of various alternatives need not be displayed in a monetary cost-benefit analysis and should not be when there are important qualitative considerations.”</p> <p>The Interagency Working Group (IWG) of federal agencies was convened in order to facilitate compliance with Executive Order 12866, which requires that agencies recognize costs and benefits of regulatory rulemaking, including the Social Cost of Carbon (SCC). The IWG developed a technical approach for monetizing the potential social cost from cumulative global emissions when developing regulation. The FCCP and Navajo Mine Energy Project EIS is not being prepared to support the promulgation of a regulation, but to inform the agencies’ decisions whether or not to approve certain operating permits, lease amendments and right-of-way renewals.</p> <p>A quantitative analysis of the SCC has been added to the Final EIS in Section 4.2. The Draft EIS considered the SCC in a qualitative manner, but did not quantify the effects. Subsequent to issuance of the Draft EIS,</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							CEQ published Draft Guidance on climate change analysis (CEQ 2014), in which CEQ indicates that emissions monetization is not required in every project-level NEPA analysis. Nonetheless, OSMRE determined that a quantitative analysis would be included in the Final EIS, following the Interagency Working Group Methods. The results of the SCC analysis do not change the conclusions or the findings of level of significance for the Climate Change issue; however, the analysis has been added to provide additional context to OSMRE's decision.
307.030	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>c. The DEIS fails to assess the impact of mandatory greenhouse gas reductions requirements on the FCPP.</p> <p>On June 2, 2014, the U.S. EPA issued a proposed rule setting guidelines for reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from existing coal-fired power plants (EPA's Clean Power Plan Proposed Rule, 79 Fed. Reg. 34830). This proposal is known as the Clean Power Plan. Generally, the rule would require a 30 percent nationwide reduction of GHG emissions from existing coal fired power plants by 2030. The rule does not propose GHG reductions from existing coal fired power plants located on tribal lands (Id. at 34854).</p> <p>However, EPA is taking comment on how to address GHG emissions from these sources (Id.). EPA will issue a final rule on GHG reductions from existing coal plants on tribal lands by June 2015 (Id). As such, the DEIS must assess the reasonably foreseeable impact of mandatory GHG reductions requirements on the FCPP. Independently, the Clean Power Plan's 30% reduction should serve as a reasonable benchmark for gauging carbon mitigation alternatives or mitigation measures at the mine and power plant complex. 40 C.F.R. §§ 1500.2(c), (f), 1502.1, 1502.14, 1508.20, 1508.25(b)(2), (3).</p> <p>Regardless, based on the proposed rule, the DEIS should assume that at least a 30 percent reduction of GHG emissions will be required from coal-fired power plants on the Navajo Nation from 2005-2030. Operationally, this can be done through various mechanisms, e.g., by improving the efficiency of the power plant's operations, capturing and marketing methane emissions from the mine, or mandating lower power plant capacity factors and replacing that power with energy efficiency and clean energy programs.</p> <p>(The DEIS incorrectly reports the greenhouse gas reduction as a 26 percent reduction. In fact, the reduction is only 17 percent. See, Expert Report of Victoria Stamper (attached as Exhibit 29)</p>	<p>In June 2014, EPA issued the "Clean Power Plan" proposal to cut carbon pollution from existing power plants. The proposal establishes state-by-state goals to reduce greenhouse gases by 2030. The focus is on power plants, but states have discretion to meet goals with a combination of industries. The proposed regulation is subject to comment and finalization. Additionally, tribal lands are not given goals at this time. A proposed timetable is suggested for moving into the process with tribes, with July 2017 being when EPA would have a proposed goal for tribal lands. States are given a year to establish programs, with a provision for a 2-year extension; therefore, 2020 is when states are required to have a program in place. The tribes will likely lag that by a year or two, with the compliance timeframe lagging also. Therefore, the suggestion that the Clean Power Plan's 30 percent reduction should be applied to the FCPP and Navajo Mine Energy Project is not consistent with the EPA's approach to taking a state-wide look at reductions and allowing states flexibility in how reductions can be met. The EIS was changed to acknowledge the proposed plan; however, because of the uncertainties associated with whether the plan will be adopted or modified, and how it would be implemented on the Navajo Nation, there is no change to the conclusions or analysis in the EIS.</p> <p>OSMRE notes that the implementation of EPA's FIP for BART would result in a 26% reduction in GHG emissions from FCPP. The 26% reduction figure is correct. The Stamper report based calculations on power plant performance figures from the PSD permit. PSD permit applications are required to present "potential to emit" data rather than historic performance data. The historic performance data were used in preparation of the Draft EIS because they are a more accurate representation of operational conditions at the plant.</p>
307.031	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>Therefore, the DEIS should not defer an analysis of GHG reductions at FCPP until the adoption of a tribal implementation plan and instead should assume that the FCPP will likely be regulated directly by the federal government's mandate for a 30 percent reduction by 2030. In light of the foregoing, the DEIS is deficient because it fails to assess the impact of the Clean Power Plan on the FCPP and also fails to fully assess</p>	<p>In June 2014, EPA issued the "Clean Power Plan" proposal to cut carbon pollution from existing power plants. The proposal establishes state-by-state goals to reduce greenhouse gases by 2030. The focus is on power plants, but states have discretion to meet goals with a combination of industries. The proposed regulation is subject to comment and finalization. Additionally, tribal lands are not given goals at this time. A proposed timetable is suggested for moving into the process with tribes,</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						the reasonably foreseeable alternative of the retirement of either unit 4 or 5 at the FCPP by 2030.	<p>with July 2017 being when EPA would have a proposed goal for tribal lands. States are given a year to establish programs, with a provision for a 2-year extension; therefore, 2020 is when states are required to have a program in place. The tribes will likely lag that by a year or two, with the compliance timeframe lagging also. The EIS was changed to acknowledge the proposed plan; however, because of the uncertainties associated with the proposed plan, there is no change to the conclusions or analysis in the EIS.</p> <p>The assertion that a 30 percent reduction is a reasonably foreseeable requirement that should be addressed in the EIS is speculative; there is no certainty that tribal implementation will occur in the reasonably foreseeable future, if at all.</p> <p>The suggestion that the Clean Power Plan’s 30 percent reduction should be applied to the FCPP and Navajo Mine Energy Project is not consistent with the EPA’s approach to taking a state-wide look at reductions and allowing states flexibility in how reductions can be met. Coal-fired power plants are not required to be eliminated.</p>
307.032	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>Further, OSM is required to consider and ameliorate GHG pollution by law. Secretarial Order 3226 (January 19, 2001) (“Order”) commits the Department of the Interior to address climate change through its planning and decision-making processes. The Order provides that “climate change is impacting natural resources that the Department of the Interior (“Department”) has the responsibility to manage and protect.” Sec. Or. 3226, § 1; see also Sec. Or. 3289 Amend. No. 1 (Feb. 22, 2010). The Order also “ensures that climate change impacts are taken into account in connection with Department planning and decision making.” Id. The Order obligates BLM to “consider and analyze potential climate change impacts” in four situations: (1) “when undertaking long-range planning exercises”; (2) “when setting priorities for scientific research and investigations”; (3) “when developing multi-year management plans, and/or” (4) “when making major decisions regarding the potential utilization of resources under the Department’s purview.” Id. at § 3. The Order specifically provides that “Departmental activities covered by this Order” include “management plans and activities developed for public lands” and “planning and management activities associated with oil, gas and mineral development on public lands.” Id. (emphasis added). The Order underscores the obligation of OSM to fully assess a Unit 4/5 retirement alternative and renewable energy alternatives to burning coal at FCPP. Unfortunately, the DEIS is deficient because it fails to fully assess either alternative.</p>	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives.
307.033	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>Thus, OSM has an obligation – independent of its duty to consider the Proposed Action’s contribution to climate change – to consider how the Proposed Action is contributing to the ability of the area to withstand climate change.</p>	The EIS addresses climate change contributions on a regional scale (Section 4.2.2.7, Regional and State GHG Emissions). The analysis of cumulative impacts of climate change takes a multi-media approach to addressing the resilience of the ecosystem.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
307.034	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	Finally, OSM must adequately consider the cumulative impacts of GHG emissions in the region. “The impact of greenhouse gas emissions on climate change is precisely the kind of cumulative impacts analysis that NEPA requires agencies to conduct.” <i>Ctr. for Biological Diversity</i> , 538 F.3d 1172, 1217. Accordingly, in addition to considering the specific direct, indirect, and cumulative GHG pollution emissions from the FCPP power plant, OSM must also consider aggregate, cumulative GHG emissions from all sources within the region, including the San Juan Generating Station, a stone’s throw to the north of the FCPP, and the NGS, just across the border, on the Navajo Nation, in Arizona, as well as the intensive oil and gas development underway in the area. The agency’s failure to assess cumulative impacts, particularly, as here, the cumulative impacts of climate change, “impermissibly subject[s] the decisionmaking process contemplated by NEPA to ‘the tyranny of small decisions.’ “ <i>Kern</i> , 284 F.3d at 1078 (citation omitted).	The cumulative impacts from 17 regional power plants (including SJGS and NGS) are analyzed, showing the FCPP percentage contributions of regional GHG (Section 4.2.2.7, Regional and State GHG Emissions). The Climate Change section (4.2) is inherently cumulative in nature and evaluates FCPP emissions in a regional, national, and global context. In addition, Section 4.18.3.2 presents additional considerations of the cumulative impacts of climate change, including multi-media effects.
307.035	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	Unfortunately, the Project DEIS does not deviate from gross mischaracterizations and unsupported claims concerning public health, ignoring the 50-year legacy of FCPP and Navajo Mine that have contributed to mercury deposition throughout the region’s waterways, high human respiratory problems, as well as numerous other health issues.	Section 4.17 considers project-specific impacts, and the findings (negligible to minor) reflect the specific analyses and modeling (air quality, human health, ecological analyses). Section 4.18 considers cumulative impacts, including mercury deposition and its environmental impacts. Past deposition was addressed through a project-specific soil sampling program, augmented by existing information from published sources. The DEIS cites additional studies (New Mexico Department of Health, Bunnell et al.) that addresses past and current public health issues. The findings are supported by data, and adequately characterize the environmental setting including past impacts, as well as potential future impacts.
307.036	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	The DEIS discussion of Sensitive Receptors includes recognition of certain population groups considered more sensitive to air pollution, including “those with cardio respiratory diseases such as asthma and bronchitis.” DEIS at 4.1-66. Despite this recognition that perhaps there are serious health issues associated with living in proximity to FCPP/Navajo Mine, the DEIS does not contain a scientific, data-driven approach to evaluation of public health issues, instead callously dismissing impacts to people – including the elderly and children – who live in the region.	Public health issues are addressed in Section 4.17 of the EIS; see Response 307.035. The analysis for public health focuses primarily on the human health risks from exposure to contaminants in air emissions produced by the proposed activities at the Navajo Mine and FCPP. Public health risks associated with hazardous materials, including the potential for public exposure to hazardous wastes, hazardous materials, or CCR is discussed in Section 4.15, Hazardous and Solid Wastes. In addition, the Draft EIS cites two public health studies conducted within the vicinity of the FCPP and Navajo Mine to further address this issue.
307.037	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	OSM must consider the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of allowing the Navajo Mine and FCPP to pollute for another 25 years, but the DEIS fails to do so. See 40 C.F.R. §§ 1508.25(c); 1508.7; <i>Utahns for Better Transp. v. U.S. Dep’t of Transp.</i> , 305 F.3d 1152, 1172 (10th Cir. 2002) as modified on reh’g, 319 F.3d 1207 (10th Cir. 2003). In particular, OSM must consider public health in light of cumulative impacts in the region.	Section 4.17 considers project-specific impacts, and the findings (negligible to minor) reflect the specific analyses and modeling (air quality, human health, ecological analyses). Section 4.18 considers cumulative impacts, including mercury deposition and its environmental impacts. A detailed Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) was conducted for the Project. The HHRA was conducted according to the HHRA Protocol established by the EPA (2005b) for hazardous waste combustion facilities. The HHRA evaluated risk of inhalation of contaminations from stack emissions as well as from consumption of food and water within the deposition area. Past deposition was addressed

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							through a project-specific soil sampling program, augmented by existing information from published sources. The Draft EIS cites additional studies (New Mexico Department of Health, Bunnell et al.) that addresses past and current public health issues. The findings are supported by data, and adequately characterize the environmental setting including past impacts, as well as potential future impacts.
307.038	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>The Project DEIS presents a classic case of “perfunctory” analysis. Instead of describing past impacts from 50 years of Project operation and what those impacts have done over that time period populations in the area, or performing a public health study as requested, the Project DEIS summarizes a few studies in a couple of paragraphs, brushes them off as not specific enough to determine impacts with certainty, and then summarily concludes that health impacts are therefore minor. DEIS at 4.17-4. For example, the DEIS quotes a recent Community Health Profile, which concludes:</p> <p>San Juan County’s most recent Community Health Profile includes a comprehensive overview of health indicators including respiratory health (San Juan County 2010). This study found that San Juan County has a higher incidence of chronic lower respiratory disease (CLRD) comprised of chronic bronchitis, asthma, and emphysema compared to New Mexico or the rest of the United States. Another study found that elevated levels of ozone in San Juan County were linked to incidence of asthma-related medical visits. This study found that San Juan County residents are 34 percent more likely to have asthma-related medical visits after 20 parts per billion increases in local ozone levels (NMDH 2007). DEIS at 4.17-4.</p> <p>Instead of considering the impacts of the Project in that context, OSM considers the Proposed Action in a vacuum, conducting a risk analysis solely based on future air emissions from FCPP. See DEIS at 4.17-23-24. Based entirely on that analysis, which did not take into account possible impacts from water contamination or other exposure pathways, OSM concludes that the “effects are minor.” DEIS at 4.17-24. The DEIS’s cumulative impacts analysis is no better, focusing again solely on air emissions from FCPP, and using primarily “default exposure assumptions” rather than actual data from the site to assess impacts. DEIS at 4.18-53.</p>	<p>See response to EPA comment 243.009 for response to “perfunctory analysis”, and use of the New Mexico Department of Health study, Bunnell et al., and project specific analysis addressing project-specific and cumulative impacts to community health. Section 4.18 (cumulative) has been augmented to include the discussion from Section 4.17 (Public Health and Safety) as it pertains to this issue.</p> <p>The comment notes “pollution that exceeds EPA standards,” but arsenic is present at high, natural levels in the background soils of much of the US Southwest including the Four Corners area. With regard to arsenic, the sentence quoted is cited in the Draft EIS as AECOM 2013. This report cites USGS soil sampling data which shows arsenic concentrations in soil, beyond the FCPP deposition and therefore representing the natural background of the area ranging from 3.9 to 10 mg/kg (average 5.9 mg/kg).</p> <p>As stated in Section 4.18, shallow soil samples within the deposition area averaged 4.17 mg/kg, well within the same range of high natural background. Similar to the detailed discussion provided in 4.18.3.8 for metals, from the comparison of these data, it can be seen that recently measured soil metals concentrations within the future FCPP deposition area are generally within the range reported by the USGS for New Mexico. While regional variation in soil metals concentrations would be expected across the U.S, these data show that the arsenic concentrations currently within the deposition area (e.g., current conditions) would not be discernably different from the regional background level. However, it is also possible that concentrations measured in soils across the US Southwest reflect a mixture comprising both a natural geologic source as well as long-term historical anthropogenic contributions. Regardless of source, the current conditions data relates directly to past and present cumulative impacts since they integrate across time and space all local, regional, and global sources including naturally-occurring sources and those released from the first 50 years of FCPP emissions that may have been deposited in the San Juan Basin. Compared to environmental benchmarks such as background concentrations, the historic operations did not lead to discernably-increased concentrations. Based on the modeling of future conditions, the impact of future operations similarly would not lead to increases in arsenic above background levels.</p>

307.039	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>OSM similarly dismisses the Project’s contribution to decreased ambient air quality, summarily stating that the counties within the air basin are attainment areas for criteria pollutants, and apparently therefore assuming that no further analysis is necessary. DEIS at 4.18-54. Compliance with NAAQS does not excuse OSM from its obligation to consider the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on public health from the Project. <i>S. Fork Band Council v. U.S. Dept. of the Int.</i>, 588 F.3d 718, 726 (9th Cir. 2009) (citing <i>Klamath-Siskiyou Wildlands Center v. BLM</i>, 387 F.3d 989, 998 (9th Cir. 2004)) (BLM’s argument that it need not consider impacts because a facility operated under a state permit issued pursuant to the Clean Air Act is “without merit”); <i>Southern Oregon Citizens Against Toxic Sprays v. Clark</i>, 720 F.2d 1475, 1480 (9th Cir. 1983) (another agency’s consideration of environmental impacts does not relieve BLM of its duty to consider effects; “BLM must assess independently [the impacts]”); see also <i>Calvert Cliffs’ Coordinating Comm., Inc. v. U. S. Atomic Energy Comm’n</i>, 449 F.2d 1109, 1123 (D.C. Cir. 1971) (“Certification by another agency that its own environmental standards are satisfied involves an entirely different kind of judgment.”).</p>	<p>The Draft EIS relied upon multiple lines of evidence to address air quality and its effects on public health. The Human Health Risk Assessment addressed the public health consequences of atmospheric deposition of air pollutants; the Fugitive Dust Analysis addressed whether the PM NAAQS are protective of public health, using the composition of Navajo Mine coal as the dust; and the Diesel Particulate Model addressed the public health impacts of air emissions from diesel equipment. In addition, the air quality analysis leading to the conclusion that the Four Corners Region is in attainment is extensive. The following sources of data were included in the analysis:</p> <p>A regional air monitoring network composed of 17 stations collectively measure ambient concentrations of six criteria air pollutants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State and Local Air Monitoring Stations (SLAMS) (New Mexico, Colorado)</li> <li>• Tribal Monitors (Navajo Nation, Southern Ute Indian Tribe)</li> <li>• Non-EPA Federal Monitors (USFS, NPS)</li> <li>• Special Purpose Monitors (Colorado)</li> <li>• Interagency Monitoring of Protected Visual Environments (IMPROVE) (NPS)</li> </ul> <p>NMED Air Quality Modeling Study for the Four Corners Region (2009). The study addressed air quality impacts of growth, especially the oil and gas industry and electric power generation, on Class I and surrounding Class II areas in the Four Corners region.</p> <p>The Four Corners Air Quality Task Force model of air quality impacts of proposed mitigation strategies. A high resolution regional scale dispersion model of the Four Corners region was developed.</p> <p>An updated 2005 emissions inventory and a projected inventory for 2018 were developed. The 2005 and 2018 inventories comprised emissions from electric power generation, oil and gas exploration and production, other proximate anthropogenic sources, along with applicable mobile source, fugitive dust, biogenic, and wildfire emissions.</p> <p>The EPA and National Acid Deposition Program (NADP) operate nationwide networks of deposition-oriented monitoring sites.</p> <p>CASTNET data were used for the historic 12-year period from 2000 through 2011. The data were used to illustrate historic deposition trends as measured by the CASTNET monitoring program, showing absolute amounts of precipitation, total nitrogen compounds, and total sulfur compounds over the 12-year period.</p> <p>Annual summary data from seven National Trends Network (NTN) sites located at Canyonlands, Grand Canyon, Mesa Verde, Petrified Forest, Alamosa, Bandelier, and Green River was aggregated to provide a general estimate of historic deposition in the Four Corners region.</p> <p>Annual sampling data from four Mercury Deposition Network (MDN) sites located at Sycamore Canyon, Molas Pass, Mesa Verde, and Navajo</p>
---------	-----	-------	----------	------	----------	--	--

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							<p>Lake were compared and aggregated to provide a general estimate of historic mercury deposition in the Four Corners region.</p> <p>Annual sampling data from two AMoN sites located in Navajo Lake and Farmington were compared and aggregated to provide a general estimate of historic ambient ammonia concentrations in the Four Corners region.</p> <p>Several quantitative models were developed by the project applicants and critically reviewed for adequacy and accuracy by OSMRE. These models evaluate the potential air quality impacts of the Proposed Action and alternatives. These include calculations of mobile and stationary source emissions in comparison to federal standards; air deposition modeling; Ozone Assessment; and plume visibility.</p>
307.040	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>The DEIS then attempts to take credit for an assumption that air emissions would be reduced in San Juan County and respiratory health status of residents, somehow justifying the continued operation of FCPP for another 25 years from 2016:</p> <p>The cumulative public health effects also depend on the ambient air quality in the San Juan Air Basin and the respiratory health status of residents in the area. San Juan County and the other counties within the San Juan Air Basin are all designated as attainment areas for criteria pollutants. With the implementation of BART at FCPP, emissions from FCPP were reduced in comparison to baseline emissions. Given current regulatory trends, it is likely that allowable PM and ozone precursor emissions for all sources in San Juan County, including Navajo Mine, would be reduced to meet tighter ambient air quality standards for ozone and PM2.5. As a result, ambient air concentrations of ozone and PM in San Juan County would be lower. Overall, there would be minor cumulative public health effects of the Proposed Action because there would be no measureable change to ambient air quality compared to baseline conditions, and there would be a reduction in FCPP emissions as a result of compliance with EPA's BART rule.</p> <p>OSM's perfunctory conclusion that "there would be minor cumulative public health effects of the Proposed Action because there would be no measureable change to ambient air quality compared to baseline conditions" flies in the face of the entire NEPA process, and in particular fails to satisfy OSM's duty to take a hard look at direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts. 40 C.F.R. §§ 1508.25, 1508.7, 1508.8.</p>	<p>EPA established NAAQS for criteria pollutants that threaten human health and the environment (40 CFR Part 50). The CAA established primary standards to protect public health and secondary standards that set limits to protect the environment (e.g., decreased visibility, damage to animals, crops, vegetation, and buildings). The ambient air quality standards are intended to protect the public health and welfare and specify the concentration of pollutants (with an adequate margin of safety) to which the public may be exposed without adverse health effects. The standards are designed to protect those segments of the public most susceptible to respiratory distress (known as sensitive receptors). The Four Corners area is designated attainment for all NAAQS. The air quality is therefore considered protective of human health and the environment.</p> <p>The Draft EIS relied upon multiple lines of evidence to address air quality and its effects on public health. The Human Health Risk Assessment addressed the public health consequences of atmospheric deposition of air pollutants; the Fugitive Dust Analysis addressed whether the PM NAAQS are protective of public health, using the composition of Navajo Mine coal as the dust; and the Diesel Particulate Model addressed the public health impacts of air emissions from diesel equipment. In addition the air quality analysis leading to the conclusion that the Four Corners Region is in attainment is extensive (see response to comment number 307.0394).</p> <p>The conclusion that there are minor impacts is consistent with the impact analysis methodology employed throughout the EIS. The health impacts are based on extensive analysis of the regional air quality and the EPA standards set to protect human health.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
307.041	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>As stated above, before OSM can assert that the status quo – or even an improvement over the status quo – will not cause impacts to public health, OSM must determine that the future impacts “when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions,” will not cause impacts. 40 C.F.R. § 1508.7. OSM’s cursory statement of minor impacts does not take into consideration whether the past impacts actually caused public health impacts, whether the future impacts will cause public health impacts, and most importantly, whether the future impacts on top of the past impacts will cause significant impacts. Simply, OSM has not “created a record sufficient to allow us to evaluate whether its ‘no effects’ determination is reasonable.” California Wilderness Coalition v. U.S. Dept. of Energy, 631 F.3d 1072, 1101 (9th Cir. 2011).</p> <p>Moreover, OSM cannot shun its duty to address cumulative impacts by summarily stating that impacts will not change from previous conditions, or even that they will be potentially be ameliorated. As the Ninth Circuit has explained regarding a rule improving fuel efficiency standards: “simply because the Final Rule may be an improvement over the [status quo] does not necessarily mean that it will not have a ‘significant effect’ on the environment.” Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Nat’l Highway Traffic Safety Admin., 538 F.3d 1172, 1224 (9th Cir. 2008); 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27(b)(1) (“a significant effect may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the effect will be beneficial”).</p> <p>The Conservation Groups request that OSM completely update the DEIS to establish a meaningful public health baseline identifying the multitude of known impacts from humans living in proximity to FCPP/Navajo Mine and SJGS/San Juan Mine and allow public comment on the same.</p>	Please see response to Comment 243.009.
307.042						<p>Navajo Mine and FCPP use a significant amount of water. BHP Billiton holds the water rights for the water used at the Navajo Mine and the FCPP (Interestingly, the ownership of these water rights will remain with BHP Billiton despite the fact that they will no longer own or operate the mine, and have no interest in FCPP. DEIS at 4.12-6.). DEIS 4.12-6. BHP’s right allows them a diversionary right of 51,600 acre-feet annually, with a consumptive right of 39,000 acre-feet annually for waters drawn from the San Juan River. DEIS at 4.5-32. Put another way, the mine and power plant allow the equivalent of a 71 cubic foot per second (“cfs”) diversion, with a continuous 54 cfs of that being consumed. If even more water is needed, FCPP also has an agreement with Jicarilla Apache Water Authority for supplemental water. Id. In addition to surface water use, the Project “would result in the loss of coal seam aquifers in the Fruitland Formation and a reduction in groundwater quantity as a result of mining operations.” DEIS at 4.12-6.</p> <p>The DEIS concedes that water withdrawals from the San Juan River are already of great concern, especially given reasonably foreseeable increased demands on the river for residential, municipal, and</p>	<p>Water rights for the Navajo Mine were first permitted in 1958 with the stated use. The permit authorizes use of water for coal mining, coal processing and beneficiation, coal utilization including electric power generation and production of coal chemicals. Water management plans (including those addressing reasonably foreseeable increased demands for residential, municipal, and agricultural uses) developed subsequent to that date have accounted for this use of the water. Current water use at the Navajo Mine is discussed on page 4.5-39 and current water use at FCPP is discussed on pages 4.5-41 and 4.5-49 of the EIS. As discussed in Section 4.5.4.1, no changes to water use would occur as a result of the project. Therefore, there would be no change in baseline conditions.</p> <p>The Fruitland Formation is discussed in detail in Section 4.5 of the EIS. Section 4.5.2 of the EIS states, “Groundwater production within the Fruitland Formation is limited. The majority of exploratory drill holes within the Navajo Mine Lease Area have not produced measurable groundwater during drilling...baseline water quality in the Fruitland Formation (based on data collected from monitoring wells in Areas IV North and South and Area V) is poor and exceeds NNEPA surface water</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						agricultural uses. DEIS at 4.12-3. "Future water development within the basin is anticipated to occur and has the potential to affect species dependent on the flow regime of the San Juan River." DEIS 4.12-3. OSM fails to take the next step, however, of considering the impact of large withdrawals for mining and power production at the Navajo Mine and FCPP and how those could be mitigated.	quality standards for livestock watering and drinking water." Discussion of impacts to the Fruitland Formation can be found in Section 4.5.4.1 which states, "The amount of groundwater encountered during the proposed mining is expected to be limited. No water supply wells are located in the Fruitland Formation within the ROI. Additionally, the projected drawdown during mining would not affect any existing or anticipated future use based on drawdowns from the modeling simulations."  The shutdown of Units 1, 2, 3 decreased overall water usage at the FCPP; however, the analysis considers that the water right would remain the same and therefore does not include this as a beneficial impact.
307.043	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	The DEIS ignores the severity of the associated impacts between climate change and drought plaguing the U.S. Southwest. APS's quest to retrofit and continue operations at FCPP will require more water and result in more water scarcity.  Despite this combination of scarce resources, and large consumptive use, the DEIS fails to take a hard look at the Project's impact to water resources, not only in its consumptive use, but the impacts the Project has to water quality, which effectively decreases the amount of water in the system available for higher uses. First, OSM fails to consider the impact to water quality as a result of the installation of SCR. Second, OSM fails to look analyze reasonably foreseeable actions under the Clean Water Act. Finally, OSM fails to take a hard look at numerous other ways in which the Project is polluting ground and surface waters.	Water use at the Navajo Mine and FCPP is permitted through the New Mexico Office of State Engineer (Permit 2838). Consumptive use for the duration of the project, with required BART retrofits at the FCPP, would not increase above the water rights allowed (See Section 2.2.4). The reduction in metal emissions from the FCPP, and accordingly the reduced deposition into surface water, is the result of the shutdown of Units 1, 2, and 3, and not due to the installation of SCR. There would be no change in the concentration of metals deposited into surface water as a result of the installation of SCR, and accordingly, no impact to surface water quality. Further, installation of the SCR would not change the composition of the CCR that would be disposed. With regard to the "hard look" at the project impacts to water resources, please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis.
307.044	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		Glaringly missing from OSM's analysis on water quality impacts is the DEIS's complete lack of information on how water quality will change given the installation of Selective Catalytic Reduction on units 4 and 5 for any post-2016 operation. DEIS at 4.5-41. OSM asserts: "Neither of these completed Federal actions [mine transfer and BART] would change the affected environment for water resources/hydrology." DEIS at 4.5-41. This conclusion, however, simply ignores basic principles of physics.	Installation of SCR is an already completed action by EPA. The Draft EIS described the installation of the SCR as part of the baseline. The reduction in metal emissions from the FCPP is the result of the shutdown of Units 1, 2, and 3, and not due to the installation of SCR. Installation of the SCR would not change the composition of the CCR that would be disposed. Dry ash would be placed within a lined disposal area. Therefore, the analysis provided in Section 4.5 regarding the potential impacts to groundwater and surface water quality from FCPP operations is correct. Further, there is no water involved in the operation of SCR. Therefore, there would be no impact to water quality as a result of the SCR.
307.045	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	Without SCR, significant amounts of pollutants have been allowed to escape into the air with numerous impacts to air quality, water quality, public health, wildlife, and the environment generally. SCR will improve those impacts. However, SCR does not make these pollutants magically disappear. Rather, it transfers them from the plant's stack emissions to its coal ash waste, with likely impacts to water quality. These impacts are made even more likely – if not virtually certain – if OSM is entirely failing to consider the issue as its specific conclusion that SCR installation will not affect water resources indicates.	Installation of SCR is an already completed action by EPA. The Draft EIS described the installation of the SCR as part of the baseline. The reduction in metal emissions from the FCPP is the result of the shutdown of Units 1, 2, and 3, and not due to the installation of SCR. Installation of the SCR would not change the composition of the CCR that would be disposed. Dry ash would be placed within a lined disposal area. Therefore, the analysis provided in Section 4.5 regarding the potential impacts to groundwater and surface water quality from FCPP operations is correct. Further, there is no water involved in the operation of SCR.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p>As noted above, once an agency chooses to “trumpet” the benefits of an action, it also must disclose the related costs. <i>Sierra Club v. Sigler</i>, 695 F.2d 957, 979 (5th Cir. 1983) (“There can be no hard look at costs and benefits unless all costs are disclosed.”). Although SCR is an improvement to current operations, OSM has nevertheless failed to address the related impacts to water quality that it could cause if the Proposed Action is chosen and operations continue for another 25 years.</p> <p>Despite the fact that OSM includes the BART decision as part of its “baseline,” OSM “trumpet[s]” that decision’s benefits. <i>Id.</i>; see, e.g., DEIS at 4.1-67, 4.1-69. OSM calculates that arsenic will be reduced by 96 percent, lead by 96 percent, mercury by 81 percent, and selenium by 95 percent, among other heavy metal reductions. DEIS at 4.1-67-69. These figures are striking – both because of the positive impact that these decreases will have on air quality, but in the context of water quality, they are also striking because such massive decreases in air emissions mean that those heavy metals must necessarily go into the coal ash waste stream. Historically, units 4 and 5 contributed 2,412 pounds per year of arsenic to air emissions; post-2014, they will contribute only 124 pounds per year. Consequently, 2,288 pounds per year of arsenic that was not previously in the coal ash waste stream will now be present there. DEIS at 4.1-69. In addition, there will be 2,281 additional pounds of lead per year, 352 pounds of mercury, and 7,083 pounds of selenium per year added to the CCW, as well as numerous other hazardous pollutants. DEIS at 4.1-69-70. OSM’s failure to consider these contributions in the context of its hard look at impacts—and consideration of alternatives and mitigation measures for coal ash waste disposal—is arbitrary and capricious and must be remedied.</p>	Therefore, there would be no impact to water quality as a result of the SCR.
307.046	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>At the public meetings, SJCA raised the question as to why the NPDES permit for FCPP was suspiciously absent from the DEIS. Cardno told SJCA that EPA requested that the NPDES permit for FCPP be separate from the DEIS (Personal communication between Mike Eisenfeld, SJCA, and Dan Tormey, Project Manager for DEIS, Cardno, Public Meeting, Durango Colorado, May 3, 2014.). Despite the claim that the NPDES permit for FCPP will be addressed under NEPA separately, the DEIS states:</p> <p>Should this alternative be implemented, FCPP would continue to operate in accordance with the existing NPDES permit and the SWPPP (Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan). Therefore, stormwater discharge during continued operations would have no adverse effects on water quality.</p> <p>DEIS at 4-5-59. For the reasons stated below, OSM must include an analysis of the FCPP NPDES permit reissuance in the DEIS.</p>	The NPDES permit for FCPP is treated the same as the NPDES permit for Navajo Mine, which is addressed as a federal action. Based on OSMRE consultation with EPA, the NPDES permit for FCPP has been administratively extended; therefore, the existing permit governs discharges at FCPP. Since the FCPP does not represent a new source, reissuance of the NPDES permit is not considered a major federal action and is not subject to NEPA regulations.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
307.047	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	As discussed more fully below, the owners of the FCPP are under a current and future duty to obtain a re-issued NPDES permit. The DEIS fails to analyze the re-issuance of an NPDES permit for the Four Corners Power plant and also fails to assess the environmental impacts of unpermitted water pollution discharges from the plant. A full analysis of environmental consequences of the continued operation of the FCPP serves as the scientific and analytic basis for the DEIS. 40 C.F.R. §1502.16. Failure to analyze water pollution issues at the FCPP is a significant oversight of the DEIS. As such, OSM must “prepare and circulate a revised draft” of the DEIS for public comment that includes this critical and requisite analysis. 40 C.F.R. §1502.9(a).	The owners of FCPP submitted an application for a revised NPDES permit in 2005. EPA has administratively extended the current NPDES indefinitely; therefore, this permit governs discharges at FCPP. Tables ES-2 and 1-1 have been changed to include, “Approve or disapprove a renewed National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit under Section 402 of the CWA” within the EPA Authorities and Actions under the FCPP and Associated Facilities. The FCPP is required to comply with the federal Clean Water Act; there are no unpermitted waste discharges from the plant. Impacts to water quality due to continued operation of the FCPP is addressed on page 4.5-57 of the Draft EIS. With regard to recirculation of a revised draft, please see Master Response #6, Recirculation of the Draft EIS.
307.048	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	Congress has determined that NPDES permits may only be issued “for fixed terms not exceeding five years.” 33 U.S.C. § 1342(b)(1)(B). EPA’s permit program “shall be subject to the same terms, conditions, and requirements as apply to a State permit program and permits issued thereunder” including the maximum 5-year term. 33 U.S.C. § 1342(a)(3). Thus, EPA does not have the statutory authority to administratively extend an NPDES permit beyond the statutory 5- year time period. ONRC Action v. Columbia Plywood, Inc., 286 F.3d 1137, 1146 (9th Cir. 2002, dissent by Reinhardt). Likewise, a continuing shield under 40 C.F.R. §122.6 may in no event last more than five years, the term of a properly issued renewal permit under 33 U.S.C. §1342(b)(1)(B) and 40 C.F.R. § 122.6. Permit #NM0000019 expired on April 6, 2006 and thus may only be administratively extended by EPA through April 6, 2011. EPA’s attempt to administratively extend Permit NM0000019 and the continuing shield beyond 5 years is illegal. EPA has refused to act for almost ten years, and by its inaction, attempted to allow APS and the other FCPP owners to receive not only the equivalent of one additional NPDES permit (until 2011), but the equivalent of two additional permits, with no further or additional review to the ensure the efficacy of the permits terms and conditions. In doing so, EPA has illegally ignored the plain language of Congress limiting the term of NPDES permits to 5 years and risked water quality protections. Thus, Permit NM0000019 became void by operation of law on April 7, 2011. Accordingly, the owners/operators of the FCPP are currently discharging water pollution from the plant without a permit in violation of Section 301(a) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a). This underscores the point made above that OSM has an independent duty, pursuant to NEPA, to take a hard look at direct, indirect, and cumulative water quality impacts, as well as reasonable alternatives to mitigate water quality impacts. Regardless, EPA’s legal duty to take action on the APS’s pending NPDES permit application is a reasonably foreseeable action that the DEIS fails to address or analyze. The DEIS fails to analyze this issue, or any other issue, regarding the discharge of water pollution into receiving waters from the FCPP. Therefore, we request that OSM “prepare and circulate a revised draft” of the DEIS. 40 C.F.R. §1502.9(a).	EPA notes that the permit has been administratively extended. §122.6 Continuation of expiring permits. (a) EPA permits. When EPA is the permit-issuing authority, the conditions of an expired permit continue in force under 5 U.S.C. 558(c) until the effective date of a new permit (see §124.15) if: (1) The permittee has submitted a timely application under §122.21 which is a complete (under §122.21(e)) application for a new permit; and (2) The Regional Administrator, through no fault of the permittee does not issue a new permit with an effective date under §124.15 on or before the expiration date of the previous permit (for example, when issuance is impracticable due to time or resource constraints). (b) Effect. Permits continued under this section remain fully effective and enforceable. (c) Enforcement. When the permittee is not in compliance with the conditions of the expiring or expired permit the Regional Administrator may choose to do any or all of the following: (1) Initiate enforcement action based upon the permit which has been continued; (2) Issue a notice of intent to deny the new permit under §124.6. If the permit is denied, the owner or operator would then be required to cease the activities authorized by the continued permit or be subject to enforcement action for operating without a permit; (3) Issue a new permit under part 124 with appropriate conditions; or (4) Take other actions authorized by these regulations.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
307.049	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	A new NPDES permit could have serious implications for continued operations. For example, NNEPA has indicated that it is conducting assessments of receiving waters around the Navajo Mine and FCPP (Personal communication between Rachel Conn, Amigos Bravos, and Steve Austin, NNEPA (June 23, 2014).). NNEPA indicated that it expects to find that some of those waters are not meeting water quality standards (Id.). The results of the assessments could impact permit limits and thus how FCPP is able to operate. OSM must address address the impacts of more stringent permit limits both on continued operations and with regard to water quality more generally.	Based on OSMRE consultation with EPA, EPA has noted that the NPDES permit has been administratively extended, therefore the existing permit conditions are the ones that govern FCPP discharges.
307.050	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	It is important for the Clean Water Act permitting issues to be evaluated in the DEIS because the Clean Water Act regulations affecting coal fired power plants are currently evolving. For example, on May 16, 2014, EPA issued its final cooling water intake structure regulations for coal-fired power plants under Section 316(b) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. §1326(b) (EPA 2014 Cooling Water Intake Structure Regulation (attached as Exhibit 39).). Additionally, the EPA is also under a consent decree to issue final rules updating their Effluent Limitation Guidelines (“ELGs”) for coal fired power plants by September 30, 2015. As will be discussed below, the DEIS should evaluate the impact of these reasonably foreseeable current and future regulatory changes on the FCPP, including, but not limited, the economic viability of continuing to operate the FCPP an additional 25 years.	<p>EPA has noted that the NPDES permit has been administratively extended, therefore the existing permit conditions are the ones that govern FCPP discharges.</p> <p>According to the EPA proposed rule for effluent limitation guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EPA is not proposing to revise the BPT effluent guidelines or establish BCT effluent guidelines in this notice because the same wastestreams would be controlled at the proposed BAT/ BADCT (NSPS) level of control. EPA is proposing to remove FGD wastewater, FGMC wastewater, gasification wastewater, and leachate from the definition of low-volume wastes. As a result, EPA is making a structural adjustment to the text of the regulation at 40 CFR Part 423 to add paragraphs that list these four wastestreams By name, along with their applicable effluent limitations. The reformatted regulatory text for these four wastestreams includes BPT effluent limits, which are the same as the current BPT effluent limits for low volume wastes.</li> <li>• A description of the proposed rule for effluent limitation guidelines has been added to Section 4.5: On June 7, 2013, EPA proposed a rule to amend the effluent limitations guidelines and standards for the Steam Electric Power Generating category (40 CFR Part 423), within which the FCPP falls. The proposed rule aims to strengthen the existing controls on discharges from these plants; it sets the first federal limits on the levels of toxic metals in wastewater that can be discharged from power plants, based technological advances over the last three decades. The current effluent guidelines were last updated in 1982 and focus on settling out particulates rather than treating dissolved pollutants, as do the proposed rules. The updated regulation is also proposed because new technologies in the industry and implementation of pollution controls have altered wastewater streams.</li> </ul> <p>The proposed rule would establish new or additional requirements for wastewater streams from flue gas desulfurization, fly ash, bottom ash, flue gas mercury control, and gasification of fuels, including coal. The proposed standards are based on data collected from industry and are designed to provide flexibility in implementation; the rules propose phasing in new requirements between 2017 and 2022. It should be noted that the required new technology is already installed at a number of</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							<p>plants. The proposed rule identifies four possible regulatory options that vary in the number of waste streams covered, size of the units controlled, and stringency of controls. EPA will take comment on all of these options, which it will use to help inform the most appropriate final standard (EPA 2013g)</p> <p>It is beyond the scope of NEPA to forecast the cost of electricity as result of additional regulatory requirements being implemented at FCPP. The economic viability of continuing operation of FCPP with potential regulatory requirements is dependent on the ability to pass costs onto ratepayers; the basis for this decision is discussed in Master Response #13.</p>
307.051	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>Under EPA’s final rule, power plants that withdraw at least 2 million gallons of water per day from waters of the United States and use at least 25 percent of that water exclusively for cooling water purposes are subject to new requirements. 76 Fed. Reg. 22174. The re-issued NPDES permit for the FCPP must impose Best Technology Available (“BTA”) requirements to reduce impingement at the FCPP.</p> <p>The DEIS is grossly deficient because it fails to evaluate the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. the current baseline, and future environmental impact, of impingement and entrainment of aquatic life in the San Juan River and Unit 4 &amp; 5 intake structures;</li> <li>ii. the current baseline, and future environmental impact, on threatened and endangered species resulting from operation of the FCPP cooling water system;</li> <li>iii. the current baseline, and future impact, of diverting over 50 million gallons per day of San Juan River surface water from the watershed for use as cooling water at the FCPP.</li> <li>iv. whether the “the location, design, construction, and capacity of cooling water intake structures [at FCPP] reflect best technology available (BTA) for minimizing adverse environmental impacts.” If not, the DEIS must identify mitigation measures required to be taken that comply with the Section 316(b) BTA requirements and the dates of implementation. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.16(h). The technologies evaluated in the DEIS should include, but not be limited to, dry closed cycle cooling, a true wet closed cycle re-circulated cooling system that relies on cooling towers, rather than Morgan Lake, as the means to cool the high temperature cooling water generated by the FCPP. A true closed cycle cooling system (wet or dry) would greatly reduce water consumption at the FCPP and alleviate many of the environmental impacts of water withdrawal from the San Juan River. True wet closed cycle systems use only 2-5% of the water of a once-through system, such as FCPP’s. A dry system consumes only de minimis water. The DEIS should also consider capacity factor reductions and/or retirement of Units 4 &amp; 5 as a means of compliance. The DEIS should include a binding requirement to</li> </ul>	<p>A discussion of the effects of water withdrawals from the San Juan River has been added to the EIS pursuant to the new EPA rules, which were not in effect at the time the Draft EIS was published. These new rules have been reviewed during the Section 7 consultation process with USFWS, and the EIS has been made consistent with those findings.</p> <p>See also Master Response #13, Cost of Electricity.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p>promptly implement BTA as a mandatory mitigation measure in the DEIS to reduce harm to aquatic life. In the event OSM attempts to defer this analysis to EPA's future NPDES permit re-issuance, it should withdraw its DEIS until such time that EPA has conducted its analysis and allowed for public comment so that the DEIS is being prepared "concurrently with and integrated with" EPA's CWA Section 316(b) analysis. 40 C.F.R.</p> <p>§1502.25.</p> <p>v. the financial impact on the price of coal fired electricity generated at the FCPP resulting from compliance with the recently promulgated Section 316(b) Clean Water Act intake structure regulations. The DEIS should also conduct a comprehensive analysis of the total cost of all reasonable foreseeable regulatory requirements, the future price of electricity generated by the FCPP as a result of compliance with these reasonable foreseeable future regulatory requirements, and an analysis of whether the electricity generated by FCPP remains price competitive and dispatchable in lieu of the costs of future upgrades.</p>	
307.052	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>On April 18, 2005, APS submitted a Proposal for Information Collection (PIC), which was a component of a Comprehensive Demonstration Study required for compliance with Section 316(b) of the Clean Water Act (See Exhibit 41 at 4.). The PIC states that a one-year impingement study was performed by APS in 2005 (Id. at 12.). OSM must acquire the 2005 APS impingement study and make it publicly available for comment prior to finalizing the EIS. APS's April 18, 2005 letter also references technologies to reduce such impacts, a list of impingement studies performed in the vicinity of the structures and the associated physical and biological conditions, and consultations with fish and wildlife agencies. These documents must be made publicly available for comment prior to finalizing the EIS. All entrainment studies or data for the FCPP must also be made publicly available for comment prior to finalizing the EIS. Once these studies are obtained, we request that OSM re-issue the DEIS for public comment including a complete analysis of the environmental and socioeconomic impacts associated with compliance with the CWA issues identified herein. Alternatively, if OSM is unable or unwilling to obtain the requested studies, OSM should postpone the NEPA process until all impingement/entrainment studies are performed by OSM or the owners of the FCPP and the BTA alternative is selected.</p>	<p>This study was initiated in Morgan Lake, but was not completed, as the proposed 316b rule that prompted the study was withdrawn. No studies were ever conducted on entrainment/impingement effects on the San Juan River. However, a qualitative evaluation of entrainment/impingement has been included in the Final EIS at Section 4.7.4.1.</p>
307.053	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>EPA is also in the process of revising its effluent limitation guidelines ("ELGs") for coal fired power plants. Effluent limitation guidelines set enforceable pollution discharge limitation for water pollution discharges. The current ELGs applicable to Steam Electric Power Generating Point Sources are found at 40 C.F.R. Part 423. On June 7, 2013, EPA published a proposed rule to revise the power plant ELGs. 78 Fed. Reg. 34432. EPA is under a consent decree to issue a final rule on the ELGs on or before September 30, 2015. Thus, final revised ELGs are a</p>	<p>A description of the proposed rule for effluent limitation guidelines has been added to Section 4.5: On June 7, 2013, EPA proposed a rule to amend the effluent limitations guidelines and standards for the Steam Electric Power Generating category (40 CFR Part 423), within which the FCPP falls. The proposed rule aims to strengthen the existing controls on discharges from these plants; it sets the first federal limits on the levels of toxic metals in wastewater that can be discharged from power plants, based technological advances over the last three decades. The current</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						reasonable foreseeable action that must be evaluated by OSM in the DEIS. These revised ELGs will likely govern water pollution discharges from the FCPP during at least a portion of the 25- year time period contemplated by the DEIS. As such, the DEIS should evaluate the likely impact of the new ELGs on the environment, the economics of operation of the FCPP, the cost of electricity generated by the plant and its marketability.	<p>effluent guidelines were last updated in 1982 and focus on settling out particulates rather than treating dissolved pollutants, as do the proposed rules. The updated regulation is also proposed because new technologies in the industry and implementation of pollution controls have altered wastewater streams.</p> <p>The proposed rule would establish new or additional requirements for wastewater streams from flue gas desulfurization, fly ash, bottom ash, flue gas mercury control, and gasification of fuels, including coal. The proposed standards are based on data collected from industry and are designed to provide flexibility in implementation; the rules propose phasing in new requirements between 2017 and 2022. It should be noted that the required new technology is already installed at a number of plants. The proposed rule identifies four possible regulatory options that vary in the number of waste streams covered, size of the units controlled, and stringency of controls. EPA will take comment on all of these options, which it will use to help inform the most appropriate final standard (EPA 2013g).</p> <p>It is worth noting that EPA has extended its deadline to publish a final rule to September 30, 2015. As stated in the Final CCR rule published December 2014, EPA plans to harmonize the implementation of the CCR rule with the ELG and other pending related EPA rules and guidance.</p> <p>The costs associated with implementation of the effluent limitation guidelines if finalized, are summarized in the draft EPA rule. The additional marginal costs of operations are addressed through the ratemaking processes of each state's utilities commission (e.g., Arizona Corporation Commission, New Mexico Public Regulation Commission). Please see Master Response #13, Cost of Electricity.</p>
307.054	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>It is crucial that the DEIS fully evaluate the potential risks to the public health and the environment from the current, past, and future discharges from the FCPP into Morgan Lake, No Name Wash, the Chaco River, and the San Juan River. For example, local residents utilizing surface and groundwater live within 2,000 feet of Morgan Lake (EPA May 8, 2012 Inspection Report at 20, Figure 25 (attached as Exhibit 36)). There is a publicly accessible boating dock located on Morgan Lake (Id.). Consumptive fishing is commonly practiced in Morgan Lake (Id.). Primary contact recreation, such as windsurfing, is not only allowed, but encouraged in Morgan Lake (Windsurfing Conditions Website (attached as Exhibit 44)). APS has admitted that Morgan Lake is a "water of the U.S." and thus the beneficial uses of the lake must be protected from pollution discharges at the FCPP (See Exhibit 41 at 4.). Therefore, we request that OSM perform a complete public healthy study evaluating the human health risk associated with contact with surface and groundwater in the vicinity of the FCPP.</p>	<p>As discussed in Section 4.5 and shown in Figure 4.5-6, based on a review of monitoring data collected between 2002 and 2010, water quality in Morgan Lake meets the Navajo Nation standards for secondary human contact and fish consumption. These standards are representative of the results of public health studies and are meant to be protective of public health. As stated on page 4.5-42 of the Draft EIS, "the analysis of potential impacts to water quality is based on a comparison of water quality monitoring data at the FCPP and Navajo Mine to NNEPA standards. These standards, although not legally enforceable at the FCPP, provide a consistent metric against which to evaluate potential changes to water quality as a result of the project alternatives. Further, the NPDES permit includes monitoring for some constituents for which NNEPA standards exist; these permit limits match the NNEPA standards." Based on this comparison, designated beneficial uses of the lake for recreation purposes are protected and there is no human health risk associated with contact with surface water at Morgan Lake.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
307.055	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>i. An October 4, 2007 EPA Region 9 site inspection report of the FCPP revealed seeps on the eastern bank of the Chaco River (EPA Inspection Report (October 4, 2007) (attached as Exhibit 45). These seeps have been previously documented and are emanating from the FCPP coal ash dumps. These seeps are more fully described in a letter from APS to OSM dated April 3, 2013 (APS letter to OSM (April 3, 2013) (attached as Exhibit 46). Thus, OSM was clearly aware of this issue prior to the issuance of the DEIS. The DEIS should collect the following information on these coal ash seeps and make it available to the public for comment prior to finalizing the DEIS: flow rate of the seeps; all water quality sampling of the seeps; immediate upstream and downstream water quality and quantity sampling of the Chaco River; an upstream and downstream biological assessment of the Chaco River; sediment samples along the path of the seeps; all assessments of remediation alternatives to eliminate/collect/treat the seep prior to discharge into the Chaco River. OSM should also explain why its DEIS failed to address this issue, as well as the other CWA issues identified in this comment letter.</p> <p>ii. An EPA Region 9 site inspection report of the FCPP on May 8, 2012 states: Total Dissolved Solids are built-up in Morgan Lake before being discharged to the receiving water. Elevated TDS may adversely impact downstream beneficial uses, however there is no criterion for TDS in the Navajo Nation Water Quality Standards (EPA 2012 Inspection Report at 4 (attached as Exhibit 36).</p> <p>The DEIS should collect the following information on this TDS issue and make it available to the public for comment prior to finalizing the DEIS: flow rate of the discharge; all water quality sampling of the discharge; immediate upstream and downstream water quality and quantity sampling of No Name Wash and the Chaco River; an upstream and downstream biological assessment of the No Name Wash and Chaco River; sediment samples along the path of the discharge; all assessments of remediation alternatives to treat the discharge.</p>	<p>Discussion of the inspection of the coal ash disposal areas is provided on page 4.5-58, which reiterates the conclusion of the inspection that no substantial seepage was identified. The seepage intercept trenches are displayed on Figure 4.5-2. Groundwater seepage beneath the ash disposal areas is found on page 4.5-57. EPA and their consultants' assessment of the seepage from the embankments is discussed on page 4.5-58.</p> <p>Water quality data in Chaco River upstream and downstream of the FCPP is presented in Figure 4.5-9. However, the following sentence has been added to the discussion: Flow rate of the seep, as measured during the latter half of 2011, was 0.0 gallons per minute (i.e. no seepage) from July to August, peaked at 0.60 gallon per minute at the beginning of August 2011 and then steadily decreased to 0.0 gallons per minute by the beginning of October, where it remained dry through the rest of the year.</p> <p>A BA was conducted for the entire project in accordance with Section 7 of the ESA. Chaco River is included within the area of effect evaluated in the BA. The USFWS used the BA to develop its Biological Opinion, which is included as an appendix to the Final EIS. For this particular issue, our assessment indicates there is no exposure pathway to Chaco River.</p> <p>As described in the Draft EIS, APS has installed extraction wells to remove water from the seeps and return it to the ash ponds or evaporation ponds. EPA has indicated that they are considering how to address the seeps in the future; however, OSMRE's review of the data provided indicates that the trench system, as described in Section 4.5 of the Draft EIS is the best available technology for preventing groundwater flows into the Chaco River (see page 4.5-57) and based on this assessment and construction of trench to shale, it is effective.</p> <p>All data used in the preparation of the Draft EIS is part of the Administrative Record and available upon request.</p>
307.056	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>The DEIS should collect the following information on the ash pond discharge issue and make it available to the public for comment prior to finalizing the DEIS: all studies on the hydrological connection of the coal ash dumps with all waters of the United States; flow rate of any discharge; all water quality sampling of the discharge; immediate upstream and downstream water quality and quantity sampling in any water of the United States, including, but not limited to No Name Wash, the Chaco River, the San Juan River, and Morgan Lake; an upstream and downstream biological assessment of these waters of the United States; sediment samples in the coal ash dumps; and, all assessments of remediation alternatives to treat the discharge.</p>	<p>Please see response to Comment 307.055.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
307.057						<p>iv. 2013 Report of petroleum discharge</p> <p>A February 2013 report prepared for APS by Mogollan Environmental Services documents continuing and ongoing releases of petroleum, benzene, and other petroleum byproducts from the FCPP Garage Fueling Area into soil, groundwater, and Morgan Lake(2013 Petroleum Spill Report (attached as Exhibit 47). The FCPP Garage Fueling Area is immediately adjacent to, and nearly surrounded by, Morgan Lake (Id. at Figure 1. See also, 2013 FCPP Field Sampling Plan at Figure 1 and 2 (attached as Exhibit 48). In the mid-1980's it was reported that "diesel was bubbling up" to the surface of Morgan Lake (Id. at 1.). It was found that there were releases of petroleum substances from the FCPP Garage Fueling Area into Morgan Lake (Id.). The results of the 2013 investigation revealed that petroleum substances are still present in the soil and groundwater at the FCPP Garage Fueling Area (Id.)</p> <p>The DEIS fails to adequately evaluate whether there is a continuing discharge of petroleum substances from the FCPP Garage Fueling Area into Morgan Lake or other surface waters requiring an NPDES Permit and, at the least, fails to take a hard look at past, present, and future direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts from this discharge pursuant to NEPA. The DEIS also fails to consider or impose mitigation measures to remediate the site and prevent future releases of petroleum substances into Morgan Lake. The DEIS should consider and impose mitigation measures, including but not limited to: a complete investigation into the extent of the contamination with evidence of whether petroleum substances are still be released from soils or groundwater into Morgan Lake; a complete removal and remediation of soils at the site to prevent current or future releases of petroleum products from the FCPP Garage Fueling Area into Morgan Lake; imposition of a pump and treat groundwater treatment system to completely remediate the contaminated groundwater at the site; and a requirement that APS immediately apply for an NPDES permit with EPA Region 9 for the discharge of petroleum products from the FCPP Garage Fueling Area into Morgan Lake.</p>	<p>The investigation of discharge from the FCPP garage fueling area is discussed in Section 4.15.2.2.</p> <p>The following text has been copied from Section 4.15 and added to Section 4.5: As discussed in more detail in Section 4.15, an ongoing investigation is underway at FCPP analyzing potential impacts to groundwater in the vicinity of a potential fuel release near the garage storage facility. The initial investigation found that groundwater near the garage storage facility is 6 feet below ground surface and flows northwest at a gradient of 0.009 foot per foot, away from Morgan Lake. The groundwater grab sample contained 170 mg/L of TPH (Mongollan 2013).</p> <p>In addition, data from a more recent site assessment has been added to the section as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment of the garage fueling area was conducted in December 2013 to identify volatile organic compounds (VOCs) to soil and groundwater. Analytical results in groundwater monitoring results indicate detections of benzene and TCE exceeding the maximum contamination level of 5 µg/L in the samples collected from one of the monitoring wells (FCPP-GF-3). Vinyl chloride and 1,1-DCE were detected in excess of maximum contaminant levels of 2 and 7 µg/L, respectively, in the samples collected in FCPP-GF-2. All other analytes were either detected below the respective maximum contaminant levels, where established, or below the lower reading limit. These data indicate the petroleum levels are not continuing to be released into soils or groundwater.</li> <li>• APS has committed to fully characterize the impacts at the site in the groundwater, identify the source of the impacts, evaluate remedial measures and, if appropriate, initiate remediation. The objective of any proposed remedial action is to reduce contaminant concentrations in the soil to levels below appropriate risk-based cleanup criteria and to remove source material that may potentially impact or further impact the groundwater, to the extent technically feasible. To achieve the objective, the site will be remediated in a manner that ensures concentrations remaining in the soil and groundwater are protective of human health and the environment and will restore the site, to the extent necessary, to support existing and proposed future uses (APS 2014).</li> </ul>
307.058	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>v. The DEIS states "NNEPA water quality standards do not apply to the facilities or operations of the FCPP, only Navajo Mine." The DEIS fails to identify the water quality standards that apply to discharges from the FCPP into Morgan Lake, No Name Arroyo, Cottonwood Wash, Chaco River and the San Juan River. By failing to identify these water quality standards, any hard look analysis, to the degree it even exists, is deficient because OSM provides itself with no benchmarks to measure significance and to inform its consideration of alternatives and mitigation measures, as well as its assessment of the propriety of allowing post-</p>	<p>As described in the Draft EIS, discharges from FCPP into Morgan Lake and No Name Wash are regulated by the EPA through the facility's NPDES permit. Page 4.5-50 pf the EIS has been updated to state, "Further, the NPDES permit includes monitoring for some constituents for which NNEPA standards exist; these permit limits match the NNEPA standards." While the Navajo Nation has identified beneficial uses of No Name Wash, Chaco River, San Juan River, and Morgan Lake and has tribal water quality standards, per the APS lease, these standards are not enforceable with regard to discharges from the FCPP. The following</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						2016 operations, period. OSM should therefore clearly state whether State of New Mexico water quality standards apply to discharges from the FCPP or which federal, state, local or tribal government's water quality standards apply and identify all such water quality standards that apply to such discharges, using those standards as a benchmark for the NEPA analysis in terms of impact analysis, consideration of alternatives, consideration and imposition of mitigation measures, and to inform OSM's decision whether to allow post-2016 operations. If no water quality standards apply to discharges from FCPP, please state as such.	sentence has been added to page 4.5-40 of the EIS, "No tribal, state, or federal water quality standards apply to discharges from FCPP or water quality in Morgan Lake; comparison to NNEPA standards is for context only." The EIS compares the results of surface water quality monitoring to tribal standards as shown in Figures 4.5-8 and 4.5-9 of the Draft EIS.
307.059						<p>vi. The DEIS states that during construction of the new coal ash facilities at the FCPP at least one water of the United States will be permanently filled. DEIS at p. 4.5-59. The DEIS states that APS "would avoid impacts to this portion of the drainage and maintain a 300-foot buffer from it during construction of the proposed ash pond." (Id.). However, the DEIS then summarily concludes that "no impacts to waters of the US would result from the Proposed Action." (Id.). The DEIS is deficient because it fails to produce evidence in support of this conclusion. First, the DEIS fails to state its legal authority for allowing APS to fill a portion of a waters of the U.S. without a Clean Water Act Section 404 permit. Second, the DEIS fails to explain how a portion of a watershed could be filled with material without affecting the hydrology and water quality of the remaining portion of the watershed that has been determined to be a "water of the United States" under the Clean Water Act. By failing to provide such an explanation or evidence to support it, OSM's conclusion of "no impact" to this water of the United States is without support in the administrative record and is thus arbitrary and capricious.</p> <p>In addition to fully explaining OSM's rationale for its conclusion, the Conservation Groups also request that prior to finalizing the EIS, OSM produce all evidence in support of OSM's conclusion of "no impact" including a specific identification of the waters of the US that will be filled, the location of the fill relative to the remaining portion of the water of the US, whether the portion that has been designated a water of the US is located upstream or downstream of the proposed fill; and all evidence relied upon or reviewed by OSM for its conclusion that there will be no impact to this portion of the water of the US.</p>	<p>The following language has been added to Section 4.5 to clarify the discussion of waters of the U.S.:</p> <p>USACE reviewed and accepted APS/FCPP's delineation materials and approved jurisdictional request showing one isolated exhibit of OHWM and one isolated wetland; USACE moved forward with an isolated-and-not-jurisdictional determination for those isolated waters under current regulations governing isolated waters. As such, USACE has determined that a permit is required for the Pinabete SMCRA Permit Area, but not the FCPP.</p> <p>Further, as discussed on page 4.5-59, APS would avoid all delineated waters of the U.S. and maintain a 300-foot buffer from it during construction of the ash pond. Therefore, no impacts to waters of the U.S. would result from the proposed action. Based on a review of the delineation and the Project plans, removal of the non-jurisdictional drainages would not alter stormwater runoff and hydrology.</p>
307.060	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	As noted in the DEIS, "ambient concentrations of ozone and particulate matter have sometimes approached, but not exceeded, Federal standards in the three most recent years for which validated data are available." DEIS at 4.1-6. As will be discussed more fully below and in the expert reports of Victoria Stamper (Expert Report of Victoria Stamper (attached as Exhibit 29). and Howard Gebhart (Expert Report of Howard Gebhart (attached as Exhibit 49), the San Juan County is either exceeding or on the verge of exceeding National Ambient Air Quality Standards for both ozone and PM. As such, OSM's characterization of air quality being "good" is factually false, arbitrary and capricious.	EPA established NAAQS for criteria pollutants that threaten human health and the environment (40 CFR Part 50). The CAA established primary standards to protect public health and secondary standards that set limits to protect the environment (e.g., decreased visibility, damage to animals, crops, vegetation, and buildings). The ambient air quality standards are intended to protect the public health and welfare and specify the concentration of pollutants (with an adequate margin of safety) to which the public may be exposed without adverse health effects. The standards are designed to protect those segments of the public most susceptible to respiratory distress (known as sensitive receptors). The Four Corners area is designated attainment for all

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							<p>NAAQS. The air quality is therefore considered protective of human health and the environment.</p> <p>The Stamper Report acknowledges that regional air quality does not exceed NAAQS. Projected future exceedances of ozone result from The Stamper Report deriving conclusions from a different set of data inputs than the EIS (see Comment 307.074).</p> <p>On December 17, 2014, EPA published a proposal to revise the NAAQS standard for O3 from the current 75 parts per billion (ppb) to 65 - 70 ppb (Fed. Reg. 75234). The EPA proposal was published 9 months after the release of the Draft EIS; therefore, the analysis contained within the Draft EIS pre-dates the NAAQS proposal. The purpose of publishing a draft proposal is to solicit comment from the public and industry; EPA will consider comments in promulgating a final rule. In response to comments on this proposal the EPA may decide on a final primary standard of anywhere from 60 to 70 ppb, or may come to a different conclusion altogether. Because of the uncertainty in the final decision timing, uncertainty as to the final determination of primary and secondary standards, and the uncertainty related to implementation of any new standards, the Final EIS impact analysis has been conducted against the current O3 standards. In addition, EPA in their source-specific FIP for BART addressed NOx emissions from the FCPP, the primary O3 precursor compound emitted from the stacks. In this final action, EPA required FCPP to reduce NOX emissions, a primary O3 precursor compound. This settled EPA action was included in the Draft EIS analysis of potential FCPP O3 emissions impacts, and is unchanged in the Final EIS analysis.</p> <p>With regard to regional haze, please see Response 307.072.</p>
307.061	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>Not surprisingly, San Juan County suffers higher rates of chronic lower respiratory disease than the average rate in New Mexico or the United States more broadly (Id.). "Ozone levels, particulate matter pollution and mercury are all recognized concerns in San Juan and the Four Corners in General." (Id.) Therefore, a full and complete assessment of the air quality impacts – in particular relative to public health, discussed elsewhere in these comments – various DEIS alternatives is essential to a complete understanding of the implications of implementing the alternatives. As noted in the comments below, and in the expert reports of Howard Gebhart and Victoria Stamper, the DEIS fails to accurately assess both the baseline and future air impacts from the FCPP. As such, the Conservation Groups request that OSM correct the deficiencies noted by Howard Gebhart and Victoria Stamper and reissue the DEIS for public comment prior to finalization of the EIS.</p>	<p>The Draft EIS includes a full and complete analysis of potential impacts to air quality and public health in Section 4.1, 4.17 and cumulative impacts of these resource areas in 4.18. Specific comments noted in the expert reports appended to the comment letter are addressed in the bracketed responses below. See also Master Response #14, Baseline and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS.</p>
307.062	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>The DEIS fails to note that APS is projecting a future increase in heat input to both Units 4 &amp; 5 in the future (Expert report of Victoria Stamper, pp. 7-9 (attached as Exhibit 29). This will result in an increase of emissions of all pollutants (Id.). By failing to account for this increase</p>	<p>The Stamper Report derives conclusions from a different set of data inputs than does the EIS. Stamper used data from the PSD application, which is based on the power plant units' potential to emit; whereas, the EIS analysis was performed using historical performance data. PTE is</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						in heat input and the corresponding increase in pollution emissions from Units 4 and 5, the DEIS fails to accurately characterize the impact of future emissions from these units. The Conservation Groups request that OSM recalculate all future emissions from these units and re-issue of the DEIS for public comment prior to finalizing the EIS.	<p>determined by assuming maximum (i.e., 100 percent) design capacity operating 8,760 hours per year, which is not possible in reality due to required downtime for maintenance and repairs. The historical data provide a more accurate representation of how the plant operates in the real world.</p> <p>For a power plant, annual capacity factor is calculated by dividing actual process throughput by PTE throughput, whether generation (MW-hrs/yr) or heat input (mmBTU/yr). For FCPP base load, annual capacity factors determined from certified Part 75 data during the 12 year historical data period were 74.9 to 92.5 percent (generation basis) and 60.7 to 76.9 percent (heat input basis). This range of capacity factors was taken into account in the Draft EIS in order to realistically project maximum future emissions in a non-speculative manner.</p>
307.063	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>d. The FCPP Title V must be reissued.</p> <p>The DEIS discloses that the current Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7661, et seq. Title V operating permit for FCPP (NN-ROP- 05-07) expired August 1, 2013. DEIS at 4.1-15. The Title V permit must be reissued and must include all emission limitations and monitoring requirements to ensure continuous compliance with the Clean Air Act. The DEIS fails to acknowledge that the FCPP may be subject to additional monitoring requirements upon issuance of a new DEIS. The DEIS should list the Title V permit as a mandatory federal permit that must be obtained for continued operation of the FCPP and evaluate the full implications of the new Title V permit.</p>	<p>The EIS was modified to include clarification on the Title V permit provided by the Navajo Nation EPA as a footnote on page 4.1-1:</p> <p>In 2005, the Nation and owners of the FCPP entered into a VCA under which FCPP agreed to apply for and obtain a CAA Title V operating permit from NNEPA provided, among other things, that permit requirements would be no more stringent than federal requirements unless FCPP agreed to more stringent requirements and the administration and enforcement of the permit would be no more stringent than what EPA would do and that would be required under federal court decisions. The current Part 71 permit for FCPP expired August 1, 2013. FCPP submitted a timely permit renewal application on January 25, 2013. FCPP may operate according to their present permit terms and conditions until NNEPA either issues a new permit or denies their renewal application.</p>
307.064	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>The DEIS ignores the immense historic and current impacts to the region from mercury emissions and deposition. The DEIS at page 4.1-61 discloses:</p> <p>According to the EPRI (Electric Power Research Institute) baseline scenario modeling results, the maximum contribution of FCPP mercury emissions to mercury total deposition is about 28 percent in San Juan County near the FCPP and contributions range from 2 to 28 percent in the vicinity of the plant; however, the contribution from FCPP are less than 2 percent over the remainder of the San Juan basin (EPRI 2013).</p> <p>The DEIS neglects to mention the 50-year legacy of FCPP mercury emissions that have taken a toll on San Juan basin waterways. Since mercury is a known bio-accumulative neurotoxin that works its way up the food chain, the attempt of the DEIS to restrict mercury analysis to a narrow snippet of current mercury contributions is meaningless and renders a scientific analysis of mercury in the region as a result of past, current and projected FCPP operations insufficient. The Conservation Groups request that OSM conduct a complete analysis of the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of mercury deposition from the FCPP</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Response #14 regarding the baseline setting. Regional surface water quality conditions, which account for historic, ongoing power plant emissions, are described in Section 4.5.2.2. Potential impacts of mercury deposition on fish species within the San Juan Basin waterway is discussed on Page 4.8-69. Further, this topic is described in detail in the Biological Assessment submitted to the USFWS in support of the Section 7 consultation process under the ESA. The USFWS Biological Opinion based on this Biological Assessment is included as an appendix to the Final EIS. Page 4.18-43, Section 4.18.3.5 identifies mercury deposition cumulative impacts as potentially major impacts to water quality. Section 4.18.3.8 discusses in detail the potential cumulative effects to species due to mercury deposition, evaluating both current conditions (which accounts for the 50 year operation of the plant and mine) and future conditions.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						since it began operations to the present. We also request that the DEIS analyze the direct, indirect, and cumulative future impacts of mercury deposition from the FCPP in the event Units 4 and 5 are authorized to operate an additional 25 years.	
307.065	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>The DEIS only conducted minimal and unacceptable deposition analysis in the vicinity of the FCPP. For example, the DEIS fails to establish significance threshold for deposition. DEIS at 4.1-77.</p> <p>In addition, a November 6, 2012 Memo from OSM to the project proponents describes significant deficiencies with the deposition analysis in the vicinity of the FCPP (OSM November 6, 2012 Memo to APS and AECOM (attached as Exhibit 50). These deficiencies include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inadequate sampling densities;</li> <li>• Lack of identification of soil maps sampled;</li> <li>• Failure to include erodible outcrops and badlands soils in sampling;</li> <li>• Failure to follow standards and accepted soil sampling methodologies;</li> <li>• Failure to sample deeper depths of soil;</li> <li>• Failure to use standard and accepted analytical procedures (Id. All deficiencies noted this memo are fully incorporated herein by reference).</li> </ul> <p>Accordingly, the Conservation Groups request that OSM reissue the DEIS with a full explanation of how the deposition sampling deficiencies were resolved and allow further public comment on this matter prior to finalization of the EIS.</p>	<p>OSMRE critically reviewed the workplans for soil sampling methods, in part to characterize air deposition. OSMRE required more extensive sampling, both geographically and with depth, in order to adequately characterize the existing environment. As a result, the Proponents modified the soil sampling workplan, based on OSMRE comments. The soil analysis was conducted according to the modified workplan, representing a robust dataset on which to base EIS impact analysis.</p> <p>No significance threshold exists for the deposition of metals itself. Thresholds are stated for air emissions (NAAQS) in Section 4.1. For impacts to biological resources, an ecological risk assessment was conducted and results were incorporated as appropriate into Sections 4.6, 4.7 and 4.8 of the Draft EIS.</p>
307.066	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>f. Significant deficiencies in the air quality modeling require that OSM issue a supplemental EIS with public comment.</p> <p>The Conservation Groups retained the services of air quality modeling expert Howard Gebhart to review the air quality modeling performed by OSM. Mr. Gebhart's review identified several significant errors with the SO<sub>2</sub> and PM modeling (See, Expert Report of Howard Gebhart (attached as Exhibit 49 and is fully incorporated herein by reference). More specifically, Mr. Gebhart identified the following significant deficiencies with OSM's air quality modeling:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The AERMET/AERMOD modeling applies a "non-guideline" beta version of the USEPA dispersion model, without securing regulatory agency approval or documenting the scientific applicability of the non-guideline beta options as required by 40 CFR 51Appendix W. Any meaningful analysis documenting compliance with NAAQS standards needs to follow the applicable USEPA modeling guidelines, without exception.</li> </ol>	<p>At the time the Draft EIS was developed, the Applicants' air quality modeling was on hold, pending the EPA approval of changes to the AERMET/AERMOD model. Mr. Gebhart is correct in pointing this out; however, EPA ultimately supported this option for the EIS after EPA experts, having the benefit of further information, expressed support for the use of the non-guideline option in 2014 because this option is based upon peer-reviewed literature and due to favorable evaluation results. A non-guideline model justification was included in the NAAQS modeling report in Appendix C, which documented the scientific applicability of the non-guideline options. Presentations at a May 2014, EPA workshop showed superior model evaluation performance for this option with applications involving tall stack releases such as those occurring at the FCPP. EPA Region 9, the agency reviewing this approach for the FCPP EIS, agreed to its use.</p> <p>Regarding the initially suggested sensitivity study, the availability of a current version of AERMOD had been delayed until May 2014. During that time, additional evaluation studies, most notably involving a North Dakota database, indicated that the default approach without the low wind speed option is clearly over-predicting, so use of the default approach, even in a sensitivity study, would be misleading. Thus, in</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							addition to EPA's explicit approval of the non-guideline option, it was determined that the sensitivity study would serve little or no purpose.
307.067	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		2. The SO2 modeling demonstration relies on actual emissions data from Four Corners Units #4 and #5 without any documentation that such emissions would be representative of the 2016-2041 period under consideration in the Draft EIS. Such documentation is required and/or the modeling needs to be revised to reflect a more representative SO2 emissions rate. Also, OSM should adopt enforceable mitigation measures in the Final EIS to ensure that future operations are consistent with the SO2 emissions data and other operating assumptions used in the EIS air quality modeling.	For the SO2 NAAQS demonstration modeling, AECOM assumed a maximum emission rate of 2,816 lbs/hr for Units 4 and 5 operating simultaneously or 12,334 tons/yr, which is 2.6 percent greater than the Part 75 maximum of 12,022 tons/yr for the 2005-11 timeframe. Thus, the SO2 demonstration modeling is conservative and realistic because it assumed an SO2 emission rate, which is consistent with Part 75 actual historic maxima. As such, EPA-approved quantifications were used for SO2 modeling input.  Regarding the comment on mitigation measures, based on the results of the impact analysis which identified no major impacts, no mitigation measures were recommended.
307.068	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		3. The plume visibility modeling shows some cases where degraded visibility is expected over the 2016-2041 period based on higher primary sulfate emissions associated with "ammonia slip" from the planned SCR emissions control equipment. OSM should adopt enforceable mitigation measures to minimize any "ammonia slip" from Units #4 and #5, which would help mitigate the adverse plume visibility impact predicted in the Draft EIS.	When sulfur dioxide (SO2) is present in stack gas, excess ammonia (NH3) from SCR operation (slip) can react in the presence of water vapor and oxygen to form ammonium sulfate ((NH4)2SO4), which is a white crystalline compound that can contribute to plume visibility under certain atmospheric and lighting conditions.  The Draft EIS contained estimated quantities of SCR reagent that APS would need to operate Units 4 and 5 in the future (either 29.4% aqueous ammonia solution; dry urea as 56.67% NH3 pellets; or 45% aqueous urea "NOxAMID" solution). A chemical mass balance analysis was conducted, which assumed 5 ppmv ammonia slip @ 3% O2 slip as BART (mitigated) in lieu of a more conventional 10 ppmv slip @ 3% O2 (unmitigated).  The results of the chemical mass balance showed that for 5 ppmv slip (BART), about 285,000 lbs/yr (142.5 tons/yr) of ammonia would be emitted as slip, or about 1.7 percent of ammonia used (injected).  If slip were 10 ppmv, about 285 tons/yr of ammonia would be emitted as slip; thus, BART is a 50 percent reduction in ammonia slip.  Regarding the comment on mitigation measures, based on the results of the impact analysis which identified no major impacts, no mitigation measures were recommended.
307.069	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		4. The air quality modeling analysis in the Draft EIS relies on assumptions for certain equipment that limits operations for some power plant and mine emission units, especially at night. OSM should adopt enforceable mitigation measures that limit operating hours for such sources consistent with the assumptions used in the air quality modeling analysis.	The air quality modeling included conservative assumptions that would provide conservative conclusions on air quality impacts. Even with the conservative analysis, impacts were not determined to be significant, therefore not requiring mitigation measures beyond the proponent-proposed measures.

307.070	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	<p>5. The air quality modeling in the Draft EIS contains significant errors in the specification of particle size information for the PM-10 and PM-2.5 modeling. Because of these data input errors, neither the PM-10 nor PM-2.5 modeling results in the Draft EIS are reliable or accurate. In fact, the Draft EIS likely significantly underreports the PM-10 and PM-2.5 concentrations expected from the project. The modeling needs to be revised such that the particle size inputs used for the AERMOD deposition algorithms are consistent with the underlying emissions inventory. The only viable solution to correct this type of significant analytical error is to present the updated modeling results in a Supplemental Draft EIS for review by interested parties and the public.</p> <p>The Conservation Groups request that OSM correct the air quality modeling deficiencies identified by Mr. Gebhart and issue a supplemental EIS for review and comment.</p>	<p>No change to the EIS was necessary based on the comment, because the methods used in the underlying AECOM NAAQS modeling report (2013a) follow EPA-approved methodology. As shown in Table 2-2 of the AECOM NAAQS modeling report used EPA-approved emission factors and speciation data (AP-42, Fifth Edition Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors, Volume 1: Stationary Point and Area Sources; EPA report EPA 68-D-98-046; also a source test elsewhere combined with EPRI data) to characterize PM10 and PM2.5. This information is summarized below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Filterable Particulate (PM) of 0.015 lb/mmBTU is based on the 40 CFR 49 BART Rule (i.e., the objective requirement of the Action)</li> <li>2. Total Filterable PM10 of 0.0138 lb/mmBTU is based on EPA AP-42 Table 1.1-6; 92% of filterable PM</li> <li>3. “Coarse” Filterable PM10 of 0.00585 lb/mmBTU is the difference of total filterable (#2 above) minus fine filterable (#4 below)</li> <li>4. Fine Filterable PM2.5 of 0.00795 lb/mmBTU is based on EPA AP-42 Table 1.1-6; 53% of filterable PM</li> <li>5. Fine “Soil” PM2.5 of 0.00766 lb/mmBTU is the difference of fine filterable (#4 above) minus fine elemental carbon (#6 below)</li> <li>6. Fine Elemental Carbon PM2.5 of 0.00029 lb/mmBTU is based on EPA Report No. 68-D-98-046 Table 25. Summary of Available Emissions Measurements for Particulate Elemental and Organic Carbon; 3.7% of PM2.5 resulting from AECOM’s interpretation of table data.</li> <li>7. Total Condensable PM10/PM2.5 of 0.00835 lb/mmBTU is the sum of sulfuric acid mist (#8 below) plus condensable organics (#9 below)</li> <li>8. Condensable sulfuric acid mist of 0.00435 lb/mmBTU from SCR operation is based on a source test elsewhere and EPRI removal efficiency (%)</li> <li>9. Condensable organics of 0.004 lb/mmBTU is based on EPA AP-42 Table 1.1-5; 20% of 0.02 lb/mmBTU</li> <li>10. Grand Total PM10 of 0.02215 lb/mmBTU is the sum of total filterable (#2 above) plus total condensable (#7 above)</li> <li>11. Grand Total PM2.5 of 0.01630 lb/mmBTU is the sum of fine filterable (#4 above) plus total condensable (#7 above)</li> </ol> <p>As shown above, except for the BART Rule and EPRI/test data, the PM10 and PM2.5 speciations used in the NAAQS modeling report are per EPA guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AP-42 Table 1.1-5. Condensable Particulate Matter Emission Factors for Bituminous and Subbituminous Coal Combustion</li> <li>• AP-42 Table 1.1-6. Cumulative Particle Size Distribution and Size-Specific Emission Factors for Dry Bottom Boilers Burning Pulverized Bituminous and Subbituminous Coal</li> </ul>
---------	-----	-------	----------	------	--	--

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							<p>• EPA Report No. 68-D-98-046 Table 25. Summary of Available Emissions Measurements for Particulate Elemental and Organic Carbon (AECOM’s interpretation of table data).</p> <p>In general, AP-42 default emission factors (guidelines) are inherently conservative and tend to nominally overestimate emissions in most circumstances. In many cases, source testing can show that actual emissions from stationary sources may be less than emissions calculated using AP-42 factors. Thus, since EPA default emission factors – in combination with the BART upper limit for filterable PM (item 1 above) – were used for characterization, PM10 and PM2.5 emissions were not likely underestimated for NAAQS modeling purposes.</p>
307.071	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>g. The Stamper report identifies numerous significant deficiencies with the air quality analyses in the DEIS.</p> <p>The Conservation Groups also retained the services of air quality technical expert Victoria Stamper to review and critique the air quality components of the DEIS. Ms. Stamper identified numerous technical problems with the air quality analysis, including the following significant issues:</p> <p>1. The DEIS only included air quality data through 2011. Air quality data is available through early 2014 and the most recent data should be used in OSM’s analysis. By failing to include the most recent data, OSM did not identify air quality issues, such as rising ambient ozone concentrations approaching the NAAQS.</p>	<p>The EPA and the National Park Service (NPS) approved the study approach used for air quality modeling and the draft modeling studies were evaluated by EPA and NPS air quality experts. The agency experts’ recommendations were taken into account in the final modeling and EPA and NPS signed off on the final methodologies. Additionally, the Stamper Report derives conclusions from a different set of data inputs than does the EIS. Stamper used data from the PSD application, which is based on the power plant units’ potential to emit; whereas, the EIS analysis was performed using historical performance data. The historical data provide a more accurate representation of how the plant operates, because it includes planned and unplanned outages. The historic operational history is described by a “capacity factor”. Using the total “potential to emit”, as in the Stamper report, overestimated actual emissions because it relies on the “nameplate” capacity, which in fact is never achieved by operating power plants. Additionally, Stamper used different years of data than the EIS did (see Comment 307.074).</p> <p>Regarding use of annual data, in order to adequately assess historic emissions and trends, the Draft EIS air quality data analysis uses data from 2000 through 2011, an inclusive period of 12 complete 4-season years. The Draft EIS air quality data acquisition and analysis was performed in the fall of 2012 and winter of 2013 according to the Draft EIS project schedule. At the time of the analysis, the most recent full year of certified (quality assured) Part 75 emissions data and SLAMS ambient data available from the EPA was 2011. The EPA does not typically release certified data for a calendar year before the spring of the following year; thus, 2012 and 2013 data were not available in time for the Draft EIS analysis. Also, IMPROVE data only through 2010 was available, while most NADP data was available through 2011.</p> <p>The data set represents a sufficient historic timeframe from which to project general future trends, and adding one or two more years to the historic data period would not substantially affect projections of future emissions – which are based on broad assumptions about future capacity factors – or substantially affect any general conclusions about the overall magnitudes of those emissions.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							<p>Additionally, analysis was based on averaging the 2 years from 2000 to 2011 with highest emissions. The average of the two “peak” years is approximately 9 percent higher than the 12-year average, indicating reasonable consistency across the years. The average of two peak years was carried through the analysis as a conservative correction factor. Therefore, adding new data to the analysis will not change the air quality analysis or the conclusions drawn.</p> <p>Due to seasonal variations in power plant utilization, only complete years should be used to assess long-term trends. Partial years (e.g., early 2014) should not be used due to the risk of biasing results with seasonal anomalies, e.g., cold winters and hot summers.</p>
307.072	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		<p>2. The DEIS fails to disclose that many Class I areas impacted by the FCPP are not projected to meet natural background conditions by 2064. The Colorado Regional Haze plan projects that Mesa Verde National Park will not achieve natural background visibility conditions until 2168 which is 104 years later than required by the EPA’s Regional Haze rules. Arizona’s Regional Haze Plan projects that Petrified Forest National Park, Mount Baldy Wilderness Area, and Grand Canyon National Park won’t achieve natural background visibility conditions for 258 years, 234 years, and 125 years, respectively.</p>	<p>Visibility degradation is caused by diffraction, refraction, phase-shift, and absorption of light by atmospheric particles, aerosols, and gases that are nearly the same size as the wavelengths of the visible light spectrum. Without the effects of anthropogenic air pollution, maximum natural visual range in the western United States is about 120 miles or 6.9 deciviews (dV) (CIRA 1999). The Draft EIS identified the 16 Class I areas within a 300 kilometer (186 mile) radius of FCPP, ten of which host IMPROVE sites and ten other Class I areas (outside 300 km) in the general vicinity.</p> <p>The Draft EIS ranked historic dV data for the 15 IMPROVE sites into the lowest 20 percent of days (good visibility), the highest 20 percent of days (poor visibility), and the average of all days (typical visibility) for 2000 through 2010. The Draft EIS aggregated visibility data for the 10 IMPROVE site within 300 kilometers of FCPP. The aggregate data represent regional averages and trends. Mean (average) and median (mid-point) values were shown for comparison purposes. As was shown by the data, means and medians were in reasonable agreement. The Draft EIS shows that overall dV improvements are about 1.2 to 1.4 for the lowest 20%, highest 20%, and average of all days in a year. This correlates to approximately 30%, 10%, and 15% visibility improvements, respectively, over the 11-year period.</p> <p>The Draft EIS shows that regional visibility has improved during the 11 year period, apparently due to improved control of air pollution from sources such as power plants. Thus, progress is apparent toward the future goal of the Regional Haze Rule, i.e., achieving natural conditions by 2060. If the historic trend continues into the future, average dV could improve at a rate of about -0.12 per year. Thus, during the first half of the 25-year relicensure period (2014 to 2026), an average improvement of about -1.5 dV could be possible, as stated in the Draft EIS.</p> <p>The Draft EIS assessed (trended) 11 years of historic data, and it would be speculative to “forecast” future trends beyond a similar timeframe (i.e., 13 years as the first half of the relicensure period). If approved, the relicensure period would extend to 2041, 27 years from now. The goal of the Regional Haze Rule is to achieve natural conditions by 2060, 46 years from now. Prediction within that timeframe would be highly</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							speculative, hence the hypothetical label. Given the limited amount of monitoring data available and uncertainty about future emissions sources in the region, the near-term analysis is adequate for the timeframe of the Proposed Action.
307.073	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		3. The DEIS fails to analyze APS's planned future increase of heat input into Units 4 & 5 which will result in an increase of emissions of criteria pollutants, toxic pollutants, and greenhouse gases over the next 25 years.	For a power plant, the annual capacity factor is calculated by dividing actual process throughput by PTE throughput, whether generation (MW-hrs/yr) or heat input (mmBTU/yr). For FCPP base load, annual capacity factors determined from certified Part 75 data during the 12 year historical data period were 74.9 to 92.5 percent (generation basis) and 60.7 to 76.9 percent (heat input basis). This range of capacity factors was taken into account in the EIS in order to realistically project maximum future emissions in a non-speculative manner. FCPP is base loaded. There is very limited load reduction related to demand. Load reduction is largely the result of forced or planned maintenance outages. Because the plant is base loaded, the 9 percent increase in capacity assumed in the Draft EIS is not likely to occur. Therefore, the emission projections in the Draft EIS still overstate impacts and underestimate emission reductions.
307.074	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		<p>4. The DEIS greatly overstates the historical particulate matter (PM) emissions from the Four Corners Power Plant Units 1-5.</p> <p>5. The ozone analysis in the DEIS is significantly flawed.</p> <p>6. The sulfur dioxide analysis is significantly flawed.</p> <p>7. The PM analysis does not used accepted modeling methodologies.</p> <p>8. The DEIS fails to impose mitigation measures to offset air quality impacts (Expert Report of Victoria Stamper (attached as Exhibit 29). The Stamper report is incorporated by reference into this comment letter).</p> <p>The Conservation Groups request that OSM correct the deficiencies identified in the Stamper report and reissue the DEIS for public comment prior to finalization of the EIS.</p>	<p>Regarding particulate emissions modeling, particle size inputs are used only for deposition and depletion of particulate matter. All results show NAAQS compliance.</p> <p>Regarding ozone analysis, ozone concentration is variable due to many factors, including the economic downturn between 2008 and 2010. This variability might result in the appearance of an upward trend after 2010 when looking at a short period of time. However, the general trend in ambient concentration in the area is decreasing over the entire period modeled.</p> <p>Regarding sulfur dioxide modeling, the modeling is consistent with EPA's proposed approach to evaluate SO2 NAAQS compliance for areas not yet designated (the SO2 Data Requirements Rule), the SO2 modeling analysis used 3 years of actual emissions to demonstrate modeled compliance with the NAAQS. The 3-year period used, 2009 – 2011, appears to represent a conservatively high characterization of emissions relative to more recent years (2012 – 2013), based on optimization of SO2 controls on FCPP Units 4 and 5.</p> <p>Regarding the comment on mitigation measures, please see Master Response #12, Placement of Conditions on Lease and Permit. Additionally, mitigations measures beyond the applicant proposed measures and compliance with the FIP for BART are not included because impacts are not significant.</p>

307.075	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	<p>First, the DEIS fails to identify whether ash disposal at the FCPP is regulated by federal, state, local, or tribal law. The Conservation Groups request that OSM issue a revised DEIS for public comment clearly identifying all federal, state, local, and tribal laws regulating ash disposal and ash disposal units at the FCPP.</p>	<p>EPA published its Final Rule for Hazardous and Solid Waste Management System; Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals from Electrical Utilities on December 19, 2014. Under the Final Rule, EPA has determined that CCR will be regulated under Subtitle D (non-hazardous) as a solid waste. The regulation is self-implementing and applies to the disposal of CCR generated from coal-fired generating stations, including tribal lands. The rule includes provisions for dust control and groundwater monitoring. The regulation does not extend to placement of CCR in mines. The Final EIS has been updated accordingly to reflect the Final Rule and its applicability to CCR disposal at the FCPP. A comprehensive discussion of the rule, its provisions, and enforceability is provided in Section 4.15, Hazardous Materials and Wastes. Section 4.15.1.2 of the EIS includes a section titled Regulation of Coal Combustion Residue at FCPP, which provides the following detailed explanation of the regulatory framework for CCRs at FCPP:</p> <p>The EPA published the Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals from Electric Utilities final rule on December 19, 2014. The final rule regulates CCR as a RCRA Subtitle D solid waste. FCPP is required to comply with EPA’s Final Rule, which provides specific deadlines for compliance. EPA issued minimum national criteria, including requirements for composite liners, groundwater monitoring, structural stability requirements, corrective action, and closure/post-closure care. The final rule addresses the risks from structural failures of CCR surface impoundments, groundwater contamination from the improper management of CCR in landfills and surface impoundments, and fugitive dust emissions. The rule includes location restrictions and requirements for liner design criteria; impoundment structural integrity; operating criteria regarding air, run-on, run-off, hydrologic and hydraulic capacity, surface impoundments, and inspections; groundwater monitoring and corrective action; closure and post-closure requirements; and record keeping, notifications, and posting on publicly accessible internet sites.</p> <p>The rule has also been designed to provide electric utilities and independent power producers generating CCR with a practical approach for implementation of the requirements and has established implementation timelines that take into account, among other things, other upcoming regulatory actions affecting electric utilities and site specific practical realities. In order to ease implementation of the regulatory requirements for CCR units with state programs, EPA is also providing the opportunity for states to secure approval of its CCR program through the State Solid Waste Management Program.</p> <p>When coal is burned as a fuel source, the solid by-products of the process are different types of ash collectively known as CCR, coal combustion residue, or in the mining industry, they are collectively known as coal combustion by-product (CCBs). This EIS consistently refers to them as CCRs. The types of CCRs that are generated at the FCPP are fly ash, bottom ash, and FGD materials (predominantly calcium sulfate compounds):</p>
---------	-----	-------	----------	------	---	---

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fly ash is a product of burning finely ground coal in a boiler to produce electricity. Fly ash is removed from the exhaust gases primarily by electrostatic precipitators or baghouses and secondarily by wet scrubber systems.</li> <li>• Bottom ash is composed of agglomerated coal ash particles that are too large to be carried in the flue gas. Bottom ash is formed in pulverized coal furnaces and is collected by impinging on the furnace walls or falling through open grates to an ash hopper at the bottom of the furnace.</li> <li>• FGD material is produced through a process used to reduce sulfur dioxide emissions from the exhaust gas system of a coal-fired boiler. The physical nature of these materials varies from a wet sludge to a dry powdered material, depending on the process.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, prior to burning, coal contains various metals and other contaminants. When coal is burned, these elements are concentrated in the ash that remains.</p> <p>CCR can be either wet or dry. The wet material can either be generated wet, such as FGD, or generated dry and water is then added to the dry material to transport or “sluice” the material through pipes to a surface impoundment or “pond.” In dry systems, CCR is transported in its dry form to landfills for disposal.</p> <p>CCR can either be disposed of as waste, or it may be used in some capacity commonly referred to as beneficial use. The EPA encourages beneficial use of CCR rather than disposal. Examples of beneficial use are as a component in concrete, cement, gypsum wallboard, or as structural or embankment fill. Depending on market conditions and other cost factors, approximately 20 percent of the CCR from the FCPP is transported off-site as a beneficial use while the remaining CCR is disposed of in the on-site dry ash landfills (Ash Ponds 1 and 2 have been out of service since 1976 and Ash Ponds 3 and 6 are inactive). Prior to 2008, some of the CCR generated at the FCPP was transferred to and used at the Navajo Mine SMCRA Permit Area for mine backfill.</p> <p>The two primary concerns related to disposal of CCR have to do with how it is stored after disposal. The first issue is the storage of wet CCR in ponds or impoundments. The wet coal ash is contained by earthen dams, and a breach or failure of the impoundment dam could result in a release of the wet CCR, which has environmental and public safety implications downstream of the release. An earthen dam contains the CCR impoundment at the FCPP and is regulated by the New Mexico Office of the State Engineer, Dam Safety Bureau.</p> <p>The second concern is related to the metals and other compounds found in CCR. These metals are potentially toxic and have the potential to leach into the groundwater. Two factors increase this leaching risk from disposal units: the use of wet surface impoundments instead of dry landfills, and unlined disposal units have a higher risk of leaching than do disposal units with composite liners to prevent leaking and leaching.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							<p>Regulatory History of Coal Combustion Residue</p> <p>By far the largest waste stream currently generated and disposed of at the FCPP and in the past within the Navajo Mine SMCRA Permit Area is CCR. To appreciate the issues surrounding CCR disposal at the FCPP and in the past at the Navajo Mine, it is worthwhile to go through a brief overview of the long and sometimes complex history behind the current and proposed future regulations for disposal of CCRs.</p> <p>The disposal of CCR has been controversial for many years, beginning as early as 1978 when the EPA first proposed hazardous waste management regulations. At that time, the EPA excluded the regulation of CCR from its final hazardous waste regulations until data regarding the materials' potential hazard to human health or the environment could be analyzed; this is known as the Bevill Exclusion. After performing a study on the potential for CCR to cause adverse effects to human health and the environment, the EPA published the required regulatory determinations, one in 1993 and one in 2000 (EPA 1993; EPA 2000) and both times continued to exempt CCR from being regulated as a hazardous waste. However, in the 2000 determination (EPA 2000), EPA stated that national regulations under Subtitle D were needed for CCR disposal in landfills and surface impoundments because of new data about the potential risks to human health and the environment (EPA 2010a) and because of EPA's concerns about the adequacy of state regulatory programs (DOE and EPA 2006).</p> <p>In 2008, in response to an ash dike rupture at a coal ash impoundment at the Tennessee Valley Authority's facility in Kingston, Tennessee, the EPA reexamined its previous determination that CCR should not be regulated as a hazardous waste. The EPA cited findings and analyses from a revised risk assessment and an updated documentation of damages from CCR management practices and ultimately proposed to list the material as a hazardous waste (EPA 2009a). The final draft proposal, published on June 21, 2010 (EPA 2010b), proposed two regulatory options for consideration. Under the first option, EPA would draw on its existing authority to list a waste as hazardous and regulate it. The second option would keep the Subtitle C exclusion in place, but would establish national criteria applicable to landfills and surface impoundments under RCRA's Subtitle D nonhazardous solid waste requirements (EPA 2010b).</p> <p>In October 2012, the EPA announced that the final rule would be delayed due to new data and the subsequent need to complete revisions of toxicity characteristics and toxicity characteristic leaching procedures (EPA Test Method 1311 – Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure). The EPA considered a new series of tests that would replace existing leaching testing; the new methods are known as the Leaching Environmental Assessment Framework (Kosson 2011).</p> <p>On December 19, 2014, the EPA issued the Final Rule on Hazardous and Solid Waste Management Systems; Disposal of Coal Combustion</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							<p>Residuals from Electric Utilities. The rule regulates the disposal of CCR as solid waste under Subtitle D of RCRA, not as a hazardous waste under Subtitle C of RCRA. The rule applies to existing and new CCR landfills and existing and new CCR surface impoundments and all lateral expansions. The rule includes location restrictions, design and operating criteria, groundwater monitoring and corrective action, closure requirements and post-closure care, and recordkeeping, notification, and internet posting requirements. The rule requires any existing unlined CCR surface impoundment that is contaminating groundwater above a regulated constituent's groundwater protection standard to stop receiving CCR and either retrofit or close, except in limited circumstances. It also requires the closure of any CCR landfill or CCR surface impoundment that cannot meet the applicable performance criteria for location restrictions or structural integrity. Finally, those CCR surface impoundments that do not receive CCR after the effective date of the rule, but still contain water and CCR will be subject to all applicable regulatory requirements, unless the owner or operator of the facility dewater and installs a final cover system on these inactive units no later than 3 years from publication of the rule. EPA deferred its final decision on the Beville Regulatory Determination because of regulatory and technical uncertainties that cannot be resolved at this time.</p> <p>The rule becomes effective 6 months after the publication date, and establishes timeframes for certain technical criteria based on the amount of time determined to be necessary to implement the requirements (e.g., installing the groundwater monitoring wells and establishing the groundwater monitoring program), extending to 42 months in some cases. In establishing these timeframes, EPA accounted for other Agency rulemakings that are anticipated to also affect the owners or operators of CCR units, including the Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards for the Steam Electric Power Generating Point Source Category (78 Federal Register 34432; proposed rule issued June 7, 2013) and the Carbon Pollution Emission Guidelines for Existing Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units (79 Federal Register 34830; proposed rule issued June 18, 2014). Specifically, EPA developed implementation timeframes that would ensure that owners or operators of CCR units would not be required to make decisions about those CCR units without first understanding the implications that such decisions would have for meeting the requirements of all applicable EPA rules. Thus, under the final timeframes in this rule, any such decision will not have to be made by the owner or operator of a CCR unit until well after the Effluent Limitations Guidelines rule is final and the regulatory requirements are well understood. EPA's approach is consistent with Executive Order 13563, Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review, issued on January 18, 2011, which emphasizes that some "sectors and industries face a significant number of regulatory requirements, some of which may be redundant, inconsistent, or overlapping," and it directs agencies to promote "coordination, simplification, and harmonization." EPA's goal is to ensure that the two rules work together to effectively address the</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							<p>discharge of pollutants from steam electric generating facilities and the human health and environmental risks associated with the disposal of CCRs, without creating avoidable or unnecessary burdens.</p> <p>The rule is designed to be self-implementing, meaning that the requirements were such that facilities could comply with the regulatory requirements without the need to interact with a regulatory authority. The rule would apply on tribal lands. EPA sought to enhance the protectiveness of the proposed option by requiring certified demonstrations by an independent registered professional engineer to provide verification that the regulatory requirements were being adhered to. In addition, the option provided for state and public notification of the certifications, as well as required posting of certain information on a website maintained by the facility and in the operating record.</p> <p>The earliest date that a CCR surface impoundment may be triggered into a retrofit or closure decision is approximately February 2017 (the exact date would be 24 months following publication of this final rule), which would apply to a CCR surface impoundment that fails to achieve minimum safety factors for the CCR unit. This is due to the fact that the owner or operator must complete the initial safety factor assessment within 18 months of the publication of this rule plus an additional 6 months to initiate closure of the CCR unit if the minimum factors or safety are not achieved. The Effluent Limitations Guidelines rule is scheduled to be finalized in September 2015 and its effective date is 60 days following its publication. Thus, there is ample time for the owners and operators of CCR units to understand the requirements of both regulations and to make the appropriate business decisions.</p> <p>In addition, specific provisions of the rule that apply to other resource areas (i.e., water and air) are included in Sections 4.1, 4.5, 4.11, and 4.18.</p>
307.076	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		<p>The DEIS suffers from this same deficiency by failing to assess the risk to human health from a multitude of toxic pollutants via multiple pathways.</p>	<p>The EPA's oral cancer slope factor (CSF) of 1.5 (mg/kg/d)-1 is based on the studies of Tseng et al. (1968) and Tseng (1977) which reported elevated incidence of skin cancers in a Taiwanese population exposed to arsenic in drinking water. EPA's assessment was conducted in 1988 and was last updated in their Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) in 1998. The current EPA (2014) Regional Screening Level (RSL) tables also present an oral CSF of 1.5 (mg/kg/d)-1 for arsenic. Thus, the Ferreccio et al (2000) and Chiou et al. (2001) studies referred to by Dr. Fox were clearly not considered when EPA derived their oral CSF for arsenic. However, in the EPA (2010) proposed CCR rule, EPA acknowledged that:</p> <p>"The risk estimates for arsenic presented in the revised risk assessment are based on the existing cancer slope factor of 1.5 (mg/kg/d)-1 in EPA's Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS). However, EPA is currently evaluating the arsenic cancer slope factor and it is likely to increase. In addition, the National Resources Council (NRC) of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) made new recommendations regarding new toxicity information in the NRC document, "Arsenic in Drinking Water,</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							<p>2001 Update.” Using this NRC data analysis, EPA calculated a new cancer slope factor of 26 (mg/kg/d)-1 which would increase the individual risk estimates by about 17 times.”</p> <p>OSMRE notes that in their data analysis, the NRC (2001) quantitatively considered both the Ferreccio et al (2000) and Chiou et al. (2001) studies and although both studies have limitations, the NRC considered both studies to be significant contributions to the quantitative dose-response assessment of arsenic carcinogenicity. In their quantitative assessment of arsenic’s cancer potency, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) also considered the Ferreccio et al. (2000) and Chiou et al. (2001) studies resulting in the derivation of an oral CSF of 9.5 (mg/kg/d)-1, which is about 6 times higher than EPA’s current oral CSF.</p> <p>Although EPA has yet to formally update their assessment of arsenic’s carcinogenic potency, it appears likely that based on their discussion in EPA (2010) and the NRC (2001) and OEHHA assessments, that their oral CSF would be revised to a more stringent value in the future. Nevertheless, EPA (2010) took this into consideration during their development of the CCR rule. For the purpose of the EIS, OSMRE evaluated arsenic carcinogenicity using the current EPA CSF as published in IRIS given that EPA has not yet completed their re-evaluation of arsenic carcinogenicity.</p> <p>CCR disposal at FCPP and historic disposal at the Navajo Mine is analyzed in detail in Section 4.15 of the EIS. Analysis of potential impacts of CCR disposal on Water Resources is presented in Section 4.5 of the EIS.</p> <p>With regard to CCR Placement at the Navajo Mine, as described on page 4.5-44 of the Draft EIS, impacts to groundwater from historic placement are negligible due to both the very slow groundwater movement and the attenuation of contaminants of concern as they percolate through the subsurface. Further detail regarding the potential impact of historic CCR disposal at the Navajo Mine can be found in OSMRE’s Cumulative Hydrologic Impact Assessment of the Navajo Mine and Pinabete Permit Areas at Section 5.3.5.3.1 and at Appendix G.</p> <p>With regard to FCPP, statistical analyses of groundwater monitoring data described on page 4.5-57 of the Draft EIS showed no correlation between TDS concentration and time indicating little to no seepage beneath lined ash ponds. Further, page 4.5-57 describes intercept trenches and analysis of data showing the continued operation of wet ash ponds would have less potential to contaminate local groundwater.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
307.077	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>OSM has a duty to analyze “all Federal permits, licenses, and other entitlements which must be obtained in implementing the proposal.” 40 C.F.R. § 1502.25(b). Within six months, EPA will promulgate final regulations governing the disposal of coal combustion waste at coal plants. On June 21, 2010, EPA proposed regulations for disposal of coal ash. See, 75 Fed. Reg. 35128. EPA is under a consent decree to finalize these regulations by December 19, 2014, in all likelihood prior to the issuance of a final EIS/Record of Decision in this matter. These proposed regulations would require all surface impoundments built after finalization of the regulations to install a liner and conduct comprehensive groundwater monitoring. Id. For surface impoundments built before finalization of the regulations, all coal ash must be removed and the impoundment must be retrofitted with a liner. Id. The coal ash dumps at the FCPP would qualify as a “surface impoundment” and be subject to the requirements of the proposed rule.</p> <p>The DEIS acknowledges that the EPA’s “new regulatory requirements dictate that [the lined ash impoundment] be discontinued.” DEIS at 3-15. However, the DEIS fails to adequately evaluate the full impact of the nearly final coal ash regulations on the FCPP. Instead, the DEIS simply states that, “FCPP would comply with EPA’s Final Rule, irrespective of which CCR management option is selected.” DEIS at ES-xiii. This conclusory statement does not fulfill OSM’s duty to analyze the foreseeable impact of the rule on CCW disposal activities at the FCPP including, the future costs of CCW disposal, the full remedial effect of the impending rules on historic CCW disposal practices, and reasonable alternatives to future CCW disposal at the FCPP. In addition, the brief discussion of the proposed coal ash rule contained in the DEIS does not describe the financial implications of the rule on the existing or future coal ash impoundments at the FCPP, including the cost to remediate existing coal ash impoundments, the cost to construct future coal ash structures, the costs to conduct monitoring, and an assessment of the collective impact of these costs on the cost to produce electricity at the FCPP in comparison with other existing or alternative generation sources. DEIS at 4.15-27, 4.15-32. The Conservation Groups request that OSM disclose this information for public comment prior to finalizing the EIS.</p>	<p>40 CFR 1502.25(b) states that the EIS shall “list all Federal permits, licenses, and other entitlements which must be obtained in implementing the proposal”. This list is provided in Table 1-1 and the Regulatory Framework subsections of each resource area description further describe the regulatory permits and compliance applicable to the project. EPA published its Final Rule for Hazardous and Solid Waste Management System; Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals from Electrical Utilities on December 19, 2014. Under the Final Rule, EPA has determined that CCR will be regulated under Subtitle D (non-hazardous) as a solid waste. The regulation is self-implementing and applies to the disposal of CCR generated from coal-fired generating stations, including tribal lands. The rule includes provisions for dust control and groundwater monitoring. The regulation does not extend to placement of CCR in mines. The Final EIS has been updated accordingly to reflect the Final Rule and its applicability to CCR disposal at the FCPP. A comprehensive discussion of the rule, its provisions, and enforceability is provided in Section 4.15, Hazardous Materials and Wastes. In addition, specific provisions of the rule that apply to other resource areas (i.e. water and air) are included in Sections 4.1, 4.5, 4.11, and 4.18.</p> <p>The costs associated with implementation of the rule are summarized in the final rule. The additional marginal cost of operations are addressed through the ratemaking processes of each states’ utilities commission (e.g., Arizona Corporation Commission, New Mexico Public Regulation Commission). Please see Master Response #13, Cost of Electricity.</p>
307.078	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>The DEIS fails to analyze whether the current and past CCW practices violate the “opening dumping” prohibition of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, 42 U.S.C. §6945(a), and if so, the remedial measures that must be employed to achieve compliance with the Act. For the reasons set forth below, the CCW waste disposal practices at both the FCPP and Navajo mine violate the opening dumping provisions of RCRA and the DEIS must acknowledge this fact and analyze immediate remedial measures that must be undertaken to achieve compliance with the Act. The DEIS must also impose enforceable mitigation measures to ensure compliance with the Act.</p>	<p>CCR has been classified as solid waste and was not regulated under RCRA; therefore, disposal practices at FCPP did not violate the open dumping prohibition of RCRA.</p> <p>Section 4.15.1.2 of the Draft EIS includes a section titled Regulation of CCR at FCPP, which provided a detailed explanation of the regulatory framework for CCRs at the time of publication. Further, this section included the sentence, “CCR disposal for the FCPP has no direct regulatory oversight. The FCPP has no permitting process, waste characterization, groundwater monitoring, leachate collection system, dust control management, agency inspections or closure requirements</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p>One of the primary concerns of RCRA is that “open dumping is particularly harmful to health, contaminates drinking water form underground and surface supplies, and pollutes the air and land.” 42 U.S.C. 6901(b)(4). The EPA published final regulations, Criteria for Classification of Solid Waste Disposal Facilities and Practices, on September 13, 1979 to define the practices that distinguish “open dumps” from sanitary landfills. See 44 Fed. Reg. 53,438. Disposal sites not meeting the standards set forth in 40 C.F.R. Part 257 are classified as “open dumps” and are prohibited under RCRA section 4005(a). 42 U.S.C. 6945 (a). The term “open dump” is defined as “any facility or site where solid waste is disposed of which is not a sanitary landfill which meets the criteria promulgated under section 6944 of this title and which is not a facility for disposal of hazardous waste.” 42 U.S.C. 6903(14). The term “solid waste” includes “any...other discarded material, including solid, liquid, semisolid, or contained gaseous material resulting from industrial, commercial, mining, and agricultural operations.” 42 U.S.C. 6903(27). The term “disposal” is defined as “the discharge, deposit, injection, dumping, spilling, leaking, or placing any solid waste or hazardous waste into or on any land or water so that such solid waste or hazardous waste or any constituent thereof may enter the environment or be emitted into the air or discharged into any waters, including ground waters.” 42 U.S.C. 6903(3). From these provisions of RCRA, CCW practices of discharging its coal ash onto land at the FCPP and Navajo mine constitute illegal open dumping under RCRA. The DEIS is deficient for failing to analyze whether activities at the FCPP and Navajo mine have violated this federal law and the remedial measures that must be immediately employed to achieve compliance with the Act. The DEIS also fails to analyze APS’s exposure to civil penalties under RCRA for its 30 years of illegal CCW disposal practices.</p> <p>RCRA’s part 3257 subpart A regulations require that all dumping practices comply with general environmental performance standards addressing: floodplains, endangered species, surface water, ground water, land application, disease, air and safety. 40 C.F.R. Part 257, subpart A. The existing and proposed coal ash dumps at the FCPP fail to comply with these criteria and thus are illegal open dumps under RCRA. The DEIS fails to consider the open dump prohibition under RCRA and whether the coal ash dumps at the FCPP and Navajo mine comply with the performance standards in 40 C.F.R. Part 257. The DEIS must assess whether the current, past, and future CCW disposal practices comply with applicable law.</p>	<p>specific to the ash disposal sites.” Therefore, FCPP has operated legally and exposure to civil penalties is not applicable to the proposed project.</p> <p>Since publication of the Draft EIS, EPA published its Final Rule for Hazardous and Solid Waste Management System; Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals from Electrical Utilities on December 19, 2014. Under the Final Rule, EPA has determined that CCR will be regulated under Subtitle D (non-hazardous) as a solid waste. The regulation is self-implementing and applies to the disposal of CCR generated from coal-fired generating stations, including tribal lands. The rule includes provisions for dust control and groundwater monitoring. The regulation does not extend to placement of CCR in mines. The Final EIS has been updated accordingly to reflect the Final Rule and its applicability to CCR disposal at the FCPP. A comprehensive discussion of the rule, its provisions, and enforceability is provided in Section 4.15, Hazardous Materials and Wastes. In addition, specific provisions of the rule that apply to other resource areas (i.e. water and air) are included in Sections 4.1, 4.5, 4.11, and 4.18.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
307.079	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>The existing coal ash dumps at FCPP pose a threat to public health and the environment. As is discussed more fully in the expert comments of Geo-Hydro Inc., coal ash dumping practices at FCPP and Navajo mine have contaminated groundwater with pollutants such as TDS, metals, nutrients and organic and inorganic compounds (See, Expert Report of Geo-Hydro, Inc (attached as Exhibit 54). Pollutants found in the groundwater pollution at the FCPP contain metals, selenium, and other compounds that pose a threat to aquatic life, birds, mammals, and plant-life.</p>	<p>With regard to CCR Placement at the Navajo Mine, as described on page 4.5-44 of the Draft EIS, impacts to groundwater from historic placement are negligible due to both the very slow groundwater movement and the attenuation of contaminants of concern as they percolate through the subsurface.</p> <p>With regard to FCPP, statistical analyses of groundwater monitoring data described on page 4.5-57 of the Draft EIS showed no correlation between TDS concentration and time indicating little to no seepage beneath lined ash ponds. Further, page 4.5-57 describes intercept trenches and analysis of data showing the continued operation of wet ash ponds would have less potential to contaminate local groundwater.</p> <p>Threats to aquatic life, birds, mammals, and plant-life would occur if constituents of concern were transported via groundwater to surface water resources. The surface water resources nearest the FCPP are Chaco River and Morgan Lake. As shown on Figures 4.5-8 and 4.5-9, water quality monitoring conducted by both APS and NNEPA show that water quality in Morgan Lake generally meets Navajo Nation standards for aquatic and wildlife habitat, and that there is no statistical difference in water quality in Chaco River upstream and downstream of the FCPP. Evaluation of potential impacts to biological resources is evaluated in Sections 4.6 and 4.7 of the Draft EIS.</p>
307.080	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		<p>c. The DEIS fails to analyze an off-site disposal and re-use alternatives for CCW.</p> <p>The DEIS Alternative D evaluates a slightly different CCW on-site disposal configuration to the preferred alternative. As is discussed below, the DEIS is deficient for failing to analyze other reasonable CCW disposal alternative.</p>	<p>With regard to beneficial reuse, beneficial reuse of CCRs is currently occurring at FCPP, as described in Section 2.2.6.3. In 1997, a vendor began purchasing and transporting 240,000 tons per year (or approximately 20% of total CCRs) for creating concrete. Therefore, this action is already considered as part of the existing environment and accounted for in the EIS. Further, this is the only vendor that has expressed interest in purchasing fly ash and it is presumed that market demand for beneficial reuse of CCRs from FCPP is being met. Otherwise it is technically infeasible for APS to dispose of FCPP CCRs without another buyer or proposed reuse (i.e. gypsum board plant).</p> <p>As per NEPA guidelines, OSMRE evaluated an appropriate range of alternatives developed through the scoping process and consultation with cooperating agencies and the project proponents. Alternative disposal configurations were considered directly as a result of the above-mentioned consultations, but offsite disposal was not considered as an alternative because the FCPP lease area was designed to store CCR on-site and the Lease specified that this was an allowable use of the land.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
307.081	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		Despite the fact that the preferred alternative and Alternative D would disturb over 1,000 acres of land, the DEIS concludes, “impacts to landforms and topography would be considered minor” and “impacts to soils would be considered minor.” DEIS at xxvi, Table ES-12. OSM’s conclusion that disturbance of over 1,000 acres of land is “minor” is not logically consistent with the facts and thus is arbitrary and capricious.	<p>The quote provided is from the Executive summary which provides just the conclusions from each resource area. The full analysis with regard to landforms and topography is included in Section 4.3 of the Draft EIS. Page 4.3-14 states that “under the Proposed Action, impacts to landforms and topography as a result of mining operations within the Navajo Mine Permit Area would be extensive and would continue for the proposed life of the mine (25 years) or until reclamation was completed.” The analysis continues until the final conclusion on page 4.3-17 which states, “Following reclamation, impacts to landform and topography would be considered minor”.</p> <p>With regard to FCPP, page 4.3-20 states that the DFADA “would permanently alter topography through both the creation of borrow pits on flat areas of the lease and construction of impoundments as high as 80 feet. These alterations would permanently change the surface relief of the fly ash disposal area; although due to the limited aerial extent of the DFADA, impacts are considered minor.” This paragraph has been amended to also note that the proposed DFADA area is within the same area of the FCPP lease as the existing ash disposal area and would be consistent with the topography in that portion of the lease.</p>
307.082	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		The DEIS also attempts to defer an assessment of the effect on cultural resources by admitting that the proposed alternative and Alternative D would have “potential impacts to 20 archeological resources and 7 TCPs” but “OSMRE is consulting with the Navajo THPO and SHPO for determination of Project effects.” OSM has a duty to present the project effects in the DEIS. “NEPA procedures must insure that environmental information is available to public officials and citizens before decisions are made and before actions are taken.” 40 C.F.R. § 1500.1(b). This includes, “[u]rban quality, historic and cultural resources, and the design of the built environment, including the reuse and conservation potential of various alternatives and mitigation measures.” 40 C.F.R. § 1502.16(g).	As stated on page 4.4-18, the regulations that govern NHPA implementation allow for a parallel NEPA and Section 106 process for the proposed Project. Specifically, 36 CFR Part 800.4(b)(2), states that an agency may defer final identification and evaluation of historic properties if it is specifically provided for in a PA or documents used by an agency to comply with NEPA.
307.083	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	The DEIS fails to examine obvious alternatives to onsite CCW disposal. For example, the DEIS fails to consider an offsite CCW disposal alternative. This alternative could include disposal of CCW either at an existing landfill or at a newly created RCRA compliant landfill located offsite in a location that that would present a smaller risk of groundwater and surface water contamination and a reduced risk of exposure to air born contamination. The current CCW disposal areas at the FCPP are surrounded by surface waters, including Morgan Lake, Chaco Wash, and the San Juan River. The DEIS suggests that the CCW disposal areas at FCPP could adversely impact ground water and surface water. Disposal at an off-site existing or new landfill could obviate the need for the extensive land disturbance at the FCPP site and would reduce the present and future risk of exposure to CCW from water and air pollution. OSM’s DEIS is deficient for failing to closely examine an off-site disposal	<p>With regard to beneficial reuse, beneficial reuse of CCRs is currently occurring at FCPP, as described in Section 2.2.6.3. In 1997, a vendor began purchasing and transporting 240,000 tons per year (or approximately 20% of total CCRs) for creating concrete. Therefore, this action is already considered as part of the existing environment and accounted for in the EIS. Further, this is the only vendor that has expressed interest in purchasing fly ash and it is presumed that market demand for beneficial reuse of CCRs from FCPP is being met. Otherwise it is technically infeasible for APS to dispose of FCPP CCRs without another buyer or proposed reuse (i.e. gypsum board plant).</p> <p>As per NEPA guidelines, OSMRE evaluated an appropriate range of alternatives developed through the scoping process and consultation with cooperating agencies and the project proponents. Alternative disposal configurations were considered directly as a result of the above-mentioned consultations, but offsite disposal was not considered as an</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p>alternative and for failing to carry forward such an alternative as a viable option for CCW disposal.</p> <p>The DEIS also notes that “[a] portion of the fly ash [from Units 4 &amp; 5] is also sold for beneficial reuse.” DEIS at 2-24, 2-26, 2-27. The DEIS also fails to adequately examine an alternative of increasing the re-use of coal ash from Units 4 &amp; 5 as an alternative to on-site disposal.</p>	<p>alternative because the FCPP lease area was designed to store CCR on-site and the Lease specified that this was an allowable use of the land.</p>
307.084	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		<p>The DEIS also fails to adequately examine a conversion of Units 4 and 5 to natural gas as an alternative to future CCW disposal. Conversion of Units 4 and 5 to natural gas would eliminate virtually all coal ash waste and SO2 scrubber waste by eliminating coal as the fuel source. The DEIS admits that “[i]t is technically feasible to convert the FCPP to a natural gas plant” and that such conversion is “economically feasible.” DEIS at 3-49. The DEIS then arbitrarily dismisses the gas conversion option by stating, “it is not cost-effective because more commercially viable sites are available in Arizona that are closer to major load centers, which would reduce the potential for line losses.” DEIS at 3-49. This statement by OSM is illogical, arbitrary and capricious. If “line losses” between the FCPP and Arizona load centers makes a gas plant “not cost effective” then these same line losses would make the coal burning FCPP “not economic.” OSM’s dismissal of the gas conversion option is arbitrary, capricious, and unsupported by the administrative record. The Conservation Groups request that OSM “prepare and circulate a revised draft” of the DEIS and include fully analyzed alternatives to on-site CCW disposal, such as an offsite CCW disposal alternative, an increased reuse coal ash alternative, and a gas conversion alternative. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.9(a).</p>	<p>Please see Draft EIS Section 3.3 and Master Response #2 for explanation on why the conversion of Units 4 and 5 to natural gas powered does not meet the Purpose and Need of the project.</p>
307.085	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>OSM has never adequately analyzed the placement of ash and FGD wastes generated by Units 4 and 5 on the FCPP lease sit and has no current permits allowing disposal.</p>	<p>Section 4.15.1.2 of the Draft EIS included a section titled, Regulation of Coal Combustion Residue at FCPP, which provided a detailed explanation of the regulatory framework for CCRs at the time of publication. EPA published its Final Rule for Hazardous and Solid Waste Management System; Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals from Electrical Utilities on December 19, 2014. Under the Final Rule, EPA has determined that CCR will be regulated under Subtitle D (non-hazardous) as a solid waste. The regulation is self-implementing and applies to the disposal of CCR generated from coal-fired generating stations, including tribal lands. The rule includes provisions for dust control and groundwater monitoring. The regulation does not extend to placement of CCR in mines. The Final EIS has been updated accordingly to reflect the Final Rule and its applicability to CCR disposal at the FCPP. A comprehensive discussion of the rule, its provisions, and enforceability is provided in Section 4.15, Hazardous Materials and Wastes. In addition, specific provisions of the rule that apply to other resource areas (i.e. water and air) are included in Sections 4.1, 4.5, 4.11, and 4.18.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							The potential impacts of placement of coal combustion residue are evaluated in Sections 4.3, 4.5, and 4.15 of the Draft EIS.
307.086	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		<p>The NPDES permit for FCPP does not contemplate permanent storage of CCW on the FCPP lease site nor does it contemplate impacts to perennial waterways from discharges (including slurried materials). The DEIS discloses that Units 4 and 5 are expected to produce 40 tons per hour of furnace bottom ash and 150 tons per hour of fly ash during full load conditions. Using the stated historic annual average capacity factor at FCPP of 86 percent, DEIS at 2-124, the annual estimate for total bottom ash and fly ash generated at FCPP is 1.43 million tons:</p> <p>Ash produced in the combustion process consists of bottom ash and fly ash (also known as coal combustion residuals or CCR). Bottom ash accumulates along the inside walls and floors of the boiler units. The bottom ash inside the boiler is directed to the bottom ash hopper. The total production rate of furnace bottom ash for Unit 4 and Unit 5 is approximately 40 tons per hour during full load conditions. The total bottom ash production rate for Units 1, 2, and 3 was 20 tons/hour. The furnace bottom ash is collected and removed by means of a hydraulic-vacuum system and delivered via sluice water pipelines to dewatering bins. In the bins, the sluice water is decanted and the bottom ash is unloaded to trucks for disposal. Two dewatering bins are each 35 feet in diameter with a storage capacity of approximately 21,600 cubic feet, or 400 tons, with a bottom ash density of 37 pounds per cubic foot. Each bin is elevated for 20-foot truck clearance, with trucks periodically hauling the ash from the dewatering bins to the Dry Fly Ash Disposal Area (DFADA) or to construction sites for the buttresses of the dams and access roads.</p> <p>Fly ash constitutes approximately 80 percent of the FCPP's total ash output. Units 1, 2, and 3 produced fly ash at a total rate of approximately 70 tons/hour. Fly ash is produced by Units 4 and 5 at a total rate of approximately 150 tons per hour during full load conditions. The fly ash from the boiler passes through the flue gas draft system to the fabric filter dust collectors ("baghouses"), which remove fly ash from the flue gas. A fly ash handling system then removes the fly ash from the baghouse hoppers and conveys it to silos for storage. The ash is mixed with scrubber process water for dust control and to aid in compaction. Trucks then transport the dry fly ash (no free liquid) to a lined DFADA on site for disposal. The baghouse system for Units 4 and 5 is designed to remove not less than 99.87 percent of fly ash from the flue gas.</p> <p>The immense volume of CCW created by FCPP illuminates the flawed logic and deficiencies in not including the essential NPDES permit for the FCPP as part of the proposed action of the DEIS and undermines OSM's analysis by ignoring the public health and environmental impacts from this unregulated site (under EPA jurisdiction). The Ash Disposal Areas contemplated in the DEIS are very poorly located in proximity to Chaco and San Juan Rivers. The DEIS discusses the project component</p>	<p>The NPDES permit for FCPP is treated the same as the NPDES permit for Navajo Mine, which is addressed as a federal action. The NPDES permit for FCPP has been administratively extended; therefore, the existing permit governs discharges at FCPP. Reissuance of the NPDES permit is not considered a "new source" permit and therefore approval of the permit is not subject to NEPA analysis.</p> <p>A map of the supercell alternative is provided in Figure 3-5 of the Draft EIS.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						of constructing five additional DFADAs each approximately 60 acres in size and approximately 120 feet high. See DEIS at ES-xii. These DFADAs would be constructed in the area to the west of FCPP adjacent to Chaco River and perennial water where existing CCW problem remain unresolved (potential contamination to San Juan River from saturation and immense fugitive dust control problems). The DEIS then discloses that another alternative is a CCW Supercell but provides no map on the DEIS showing the facility. The concept of DFADAs and borrow areas in to the west of FCPP would exacerbate existing significant problems to groundwater and surface water.	
307.087	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>Under the Environmental Justice heading, the DEIS takes the extraordinary step in claiming that under the Proposed Action and all Action Alternatives:</p> <p>If a breach of the ash disposal impoundments occurred, potential impacts to tribal lands would be minor.</p> <p>DEIS at 3-69. This conclusion is disturbing and negligent given that a breach of the ash disposal impoundments could have potentially significant impacts on the San Juan River and Navajo Nation lands/communities. The DEIS must define the legal responsibilities and liabilities of the ash disposal impoundments before jumping to a baseless, misguided conclusion on impacts to tribal lands. OSM is ignoring the regulatory responsibility to truly evaluate impacts associated with CCW disposal. The fact that OSM has included this discussion of CCW breaches under Environmental Justice suggests that OSM would place the financial burden on the Navajo Nation to contend with breach impacts.</p>	<p>CCR disposal at FCPP and historic disposal at the Navajo Mine is analyzed in detail in Section 4.15 of the EIS. Analysis of potential impacts of CCR disposal on Water Resources is presented in Section 4.5 of the EIS. Further detail regarding the potential impact of historic CCR disposal at the Navajo Mine can be found in OSMRE's Cumulative Hydrologic Impact Assessment of the Navajo Mine and Pinabete Permit Areas at Section 5.3.5.3.1 and at Appendix G.</p> <p>Section 4.15.1.2 of the EIS includes a section titled Regulation of Coal Combustion Residue at FCPP, which provides a detailed explanation of the regulatory framework for CCRs at FCPP.</p> <p>EPA published its Final Rule for Hazardous and Solid Waste Management System; Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals from Electrical Utilities on December 19, 2014. Under the Final Rule, EPA has determined that CCR will be regulated under Subtitle D (non-hazardous) as a solid waste. The regulation is self-implementing and applies to the disposal of CCR generated from coal-fired generating stations, including tribal lands. The rule includes provisions for dust control and groundwater monitoring. The regulation does not extend to placement of CCR in mines. The Final EIS has been updated accordingly to reflect the Final Rule and its applicability to CCR disposal at the FCPP. A comprehensive discussion of the rule, its provisions, and enforceability is provided in Section 4.15, Hazardous Materials and Wastes. In addition, specific provisions of the rule that apply to other resource areas (i.e., water and air) are included in Sections 4.1, 4.5, 4.11, and 4.18.</p> <p>The costs associated with implementation of the rule are summarized in the final rule. The additional marginal cost of operations are addressed through the ratemaking processes of each states' utilities commission (e.g., Arizona Corporation Commission, New Mexico Public Regulation Commission). Please see Master Response #13, Cost of Electricity.</p> <p>The DFADAs are proposed in the FCPP Lease Area, per Amendment #3. This discussion is included in the Environmental Justice analysis because it represents a potential effect to an Environmental Justice population. Furthermore, the potential of a breach failure at an ash impoundment is discussed throughout the EIS and adequately addressed . If a breach of ash disposal impoundments led to a release of ash material into waters of</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							<p>the U.S., including the San Juan River, such failure would fall under the purview of the Clean Water Act and would be regulated by the EPA. We have added the following clarification to section 4.5, Water Resources/Hydrology: Although as discussed in Section 4.15, failure of the impoundments is unlikely, if an impoundment failed, the potential exists for wet ash to enter Chaco River. If this were to occur, it would be regulated under the Clean Water Act and EPA would have regulatory oversight.</p> <p>This issue is also addressed in Section 4.15 (Hazardous and Solid Wastes). The analysis is included in Environmental Justice because it was a potential environmental consequence. However, there was no intention to ascribe liability. The following clarification has been added to Section 4.11: Based on the rated condition of the dam and regulatory compliance requirements, the likelihood of a release is low and therefore the impacts would be minor.</p>
307.088	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>Although the DEIS discloses some of the problems associated with CCW, it fails to address the potential impacts:</p> <p>The two primary concerns related to disposal of CCR have to do with how it is stored after disposal. The first issue is the storage of wet CCR in ponds or impoundments. The wet coal ash is contained by earthen dams, and a breach or failure of the impoundment dam could result in a release of the wet CCR, which has environmental and public safety implications downstream of the release. An earthen dam contains the CCR impoundment at the FCPP and is regulated by the New Mexico Office of the State Engineer, Dam Safety Bureau.</p> <p>The second concern is related to the metals and other compounds found in CCR. These metals are potentially toxic and have the potential to leach into the groundwater. Two factors increase this leaching risk from disposal units: the use of wet surface impoundments instead of dry landfills, and unlined disposal units have a higher risk of leaching than do disposal units with composite liners to prevent leaking and leaching. (DEIS at 4-15.4)</p> <p>The admission by OSM that metals in CCR are potentially toxic and the interaction between CCR and NAPI return flows point to very serious problems that must be resolved in a revision of the DEIS. This issue is only exacerbated by the fact that SCR installation at units 4-5 will only increase the toxicity of CCW.</p>	<p>Analysis of the potential for impact from a breach of the impoundment dams is found in Section 4.15. In addition, the following language has been added to Section 4.5.4.1: Although as discussed in Section 4.15, failure of the impoundments is unlikely, if an impoundment failed, the evacuation map indicates that material could be moved down the Chaco River 11 miles to the San Juan River. However, the area of inundation is expected to be smaller than the evacuation area shown . In the event of a dam failure at the LAI, the dry material would result in the dry ash contents slumping downslope. This material is unlikely to extend much past the angle of repose. As such, if there were a release, the material is unlikely to reach the Chaco River. This may result in some slight increase in turbidity in the Chaco River, if there were flow in the river at the time of the failure (the area where the ash would enter the river is upstream of the area that is perennially wetted). In the event of a dam failure at the LDWP, a maximum of 517 acre feet of water would be released, although the normal operating level is 135 to 435 acre feet. This water would likely carry some ash with it, as well as material from the dam. This would result in increased flow, turbidity and sedimentation in the Chaco River. Most of the solid materials would settle close to the dam, and the amount of material carried along would attenuate with distance from the breach.</p> <p>Potential impacts regarding leaching of compounds from CCR into groundwater are addressed in Section 4.5 of the Draft EIS.</p> <p>In regard to SCR impact on CCR see Response 307.045.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
307.089	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>The Conservation Groups retained the services of a hydrology consulting firm, Geo-Hydro Inc., to conduct a critical review of the DEIS's analysis of the environmental effects of CCW disposal practices at the FCPP (Expert Report of Geo-Hydro Inc. (attached as Exhibit 54). Geo-Hydro's report identified numerous deficiencies with the DEIS' analysis, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Characterization of the extent of groundwater contaminants migrating in groundwater from coal combustion residue (CCR) at FCPP is inadequate.</li> </ul>	<p>The relatively constant or slightly decreasing groundwater levels described on page 4.5-10 are an indication of a lack of contribution from the ash ponds. Furthermore, Morgan Lake is over 2,000 feet from the ash ponds and is a known groundwater mounding location. Groundwater beneath Morgan Lake would be recharged by the lake itself, which meets Navajo Nation water quality standards for designated beneficial uses. Therefore, Morgan Lake would not lead to impairments beneath the ash disposal area. The ash disposal area has a voluntary groundwater monitoring program and a seepage collection system to identify and address impairments. In addition, the following language regarding future management of CCR disposal at the FCPP has been added to Section 4.5.4.1: In accordance with the Final Rule for Disposal of CCR at Electric Utilities, APS will continue groundwater monitoring at the ash disposal area at FCPP, on at least a semi-annual basis and data will be analyzed to detect potential leaching. If sample analysis determines the presence of leaching, APS will take implement appropriate corrective measures, as outlines in the Final Rule. Groundwater monitoring records will be kept in the FCPP operating records and posted on a public website, as specified in the Final Rule.</p>
307.090	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Background groundwater chemistry has yet to be adequately characterized at FCPP after 40 years of operation. Only two rounds of high quality groundwater sampling data have been generated over that period.</li> </ul>	<p>CEQ guidance suggests that agencies use the "best available scientific and technical information available". The data used to evaluate impacts to groundwater at FCPP is site-specific monitoring data over a 25-year period. This is the best available scientific information on groundwater quality conditions at the site that is available.</p>
307.091	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Portions of the DEIS appear to rely upon general descriptions of planned groundwater monitoring and remediation systems provided to OSMRE by Arizona Public Service (APS) in a data summary document (APS, 2013). No detailed designs, construction plans, or operational details are provided or even referenced in the DEIS. It is unclear how the environmental impacts of CCR disposal at FCPP can be adequately evaluated with the little available information.</li> </ul>	<p>As discussed on page 4.5-57 impacts of CCR disposal at FCPP were evaluated based on a statistical analysis of 25 years of groundwater monitoring data and a comparison of monitoring well data both upstream and downstream of existing intercept trenches. The analysis shows this design is effective. The expansion of this system is expected to follow this successful design. The analysis states that APS is currently in the process of installing a new trench as well.</p>
307.092	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many sections of the DEIS make the statement that groundwater within and adjacent to the permit area is of poor quality and is only marginally suitable for livestock watering use. Despite this, groundwater has been and is currently being used for livestock watering. The marginal quality of the water for this purpose indicates that there is very little room for degradation of water quality related to mine or FCPP operations without causing material damage to the hydrologic balance by eliminating livestock watering as a future use of groundwater outside the permit area.</li> </ul>	<p>As stated in the Draft EIS, the groundwater quality within the Navajo Mine lease area (in both areas that are actively mined and those that have not yet been mined and which are upgradient of all current and historic mining activity) exceed the criteria for livestock watering; however, as shown on Figure 4.5-1, there are no livestock watering wells within Areas I and II where historic CCR disposal occurred on the Navajo Lease Area.</p> <p>As described in the EIS, historic and current livestock watering in the vicinity of the permit area has been limited to surface and alluvial systems. Groundwater monitoring data does not indicate that CCR disposal has compromised groundwater quality for livestock use in Area I or II. Rather groundwater monitoring data shows that baseline/background Fruitland and PCS water quality has never meet livestock criteria and has never been used for livestock watering. There</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							are no current economic uses of the Fruitland Formation in or adjacent to this area and no foreseeable uses other than oil and gas extraction. Additionally, the limited data available in the Bitsui alluvium which has been used historically for livestock watering indicates that water quality upgradient of all historic mining and CCR placement was of marginal quality for livestock use. The EIS has been revised to provide this explanation as well. In addition, review of baseline monitoring wells in Areas IVN and IVS indicate that water quality in the PCS and Fruitland Formation is not suitable for livestock watering and that alluvial water is only marginally suitable for livestock watering.
307.093	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		Geo-Hydro's report is entirely incorporated into this comment letter by reference. The Conservation Groups request that OSM address each of the technical deficiencies of the DEIS outlined in the Geo-Hydro report and re-issue the DEIS for public comment after addressing these deficiencies and disclosing the relevant information requested.	<p>Please see Master Response #6, Recirculation of the EIS. Responses to each of the Specific Comments listed in the Geo-Hydro report are provided below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Page 2-23, Section 2.2.4 states that approximately 4,826 acre-feet per year is discharged from Morgan Lake to Chaco River. The water balance is provided in the Draft EIS. We've determined no impact that would further affect the analysis.</li> <li>2. The following description of material has been added to Section 3.2: Suitability of the material for evapotranspiration cover was determined through boring test pits at each proposed area within the APS lease. Only those areas with suitable soil types were considered for use.</li> <li>3. No water quality standards apply to Morgan Lake. Water quality standards are applicable to water bodies, not facilities. Designated beneficial uses and associated water quality standards for those uses have been applied to Chaco River.</li> <li>4. Data for water supply and livestock wells in the area for the Navajo Mine Permit Area and Pinabete Permit Area were gathered from the SMCRA permit applications which contain the most up-to-date information available.</li> <li>5. Groundwater level contour maps were used to inform the analysis and are available as part of the Administrative record.</li> <li>6. The relatively constant or slightly decreasing groundwater levels are more likely an indication of a lack of contribution from the ash ponds. Furthermore, Morgan Lake is over 2,000 feet from the ash ponds and would not lead to groundwater impairments beneath the ash disposal area. The ash disposal area has a groundwater monitoring system and seepage collection system to identify and address impairments.</li> <li>7. The text has been corrected to state that monitoring wells at the FCPP are in the alluvial aquifer and lewis shale.</li> <li>8. Analysis regarding impacts to livestock watering is provided on pages 4.5-44 and 4.5-45.</li> <li>9. The text has been corrected to state that monitoring wells at the FCPP are in the alluvial aquifer and lewis shale. There are no NNEPA</li> </ol>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							<p>groundwater standards. The EPA MCL is for drinking water whereas the beneficial use of groundwater in the area is livestock water. Our conclusion is based on evaluation of data which shows no discernible effect.</p> <p>With regard to the quality of groundwater monitoring data, OSMRE used the best available site-specific data to evaluate impacts, as per CEQ guidance. With regard to boron, the paragraph has been revised, but these changes do not affect the analysis. The Lewis Shale is a different zone but unimpacted. There are five wells in the alluvium that are clearly background wells (MW-21, MW-22, MW-42, MW-41, MW-43). The comparison to downgradient wells indicates no statistical difference. Also there are wells upgradient and downgradient of the trenches to analyze whether the ash ponds are affecting groundwater quality. There is no statistical differences. The two wells completed in the Lewis Shale were not used for our statistical analysis. However, their depth and location indicate that they also measure background water quality but in a deeper zone.</p> <p>10. The discussion of poor suitability for livestock water is found on pages 4.5-44 through 4.5-45 of the Draft EIS. As discussed in the Draft EIS, evaluation of potential impacts found that mining would not materially affect the suitability of alluvial groundwater for livestock use.</p> <p>11. OSMRE reviewed the data provided by APS and conducted the statistical evaluation. More detail regarding the well data compared has been added to the EIS.</p> <p>12. NEPA requires the use of best available information for analysis and 40 CFR 1502.2 states that if information is incomplete the EIS should use methods that are generally accepted by the scientific community. The statistical analysis conducted is a suitable method for analyzing the data available. The discussion of the Mann-Kendall tests have been expanded to provide greater information, including the wells included, the data sets tested and each specific test result.</p> <p>13. OSMRE conducted an analysis of the data. The expansion of the DFADA would be lined and contain dry ash. The seepage intercept trenches is for the already existing wet ash ponds. Our analysis of the existing trenches indicates they are effective. The new trench design would be similar; therefore, our analysis indicates that it too would also be effective.</p> <p>14. The impoundment in question contains dry fly ash. The GEI report states that although the cut-off trench in the northwest corner is terminated in fly ash, the report also states that the trench provides 12 foot deep and several hundred foot long compacted clay protection as described in Section 4.5 of the Draft EIS. Any water in the LAI is pumped to the power plant for use. As such, a driving force for seepage is temporary and the addition of 10 feet of head would not appreciably change that.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							<p>15. Same response as for 9.</p> <p>16. The efforts for control were undertaken due to NPDES conditions. OSMRE used best available site-specific data for our analyses.</p> <p>17. The submittal by APS referenced in the text states that boron is naturally -occurring element in sedimentary rock, coal, and shale. However, the text on page 4.15-27 compares groundwater monitoring results from wells both upgradient and downgradient of the existing ash ponds.</p> <p>18. The Final CCR rule includes specific provisions for location restrictions of CCR impoundments. The Final EIS has been updated to incorporate a description of the Final CCR rule.</p> <p>19. Groundwater monitoring is part of reclamation permitted through SMCRA. The oversight of the monitoring program is dynamic and allows for adaptive management and adjustments to be made based on the results within each monitoring well, as part of the permit oversight by OSMRE. Groundwater monitoring will continue until such time that OSMRE determines that all bond conditions have been met.</p> <p>20. Thank you for your comment. OSMRE has submitted data requests to MMCo for clarification on the Pinabete permit application. All revisions to the application resubmitted by MMCo have been incorporated as applicable into the Draft EIS. The Draft EIS analyzes the impacts of the action as proposed to the environment.</p> <p>21. All wells would be sampled quarterly so this would describe an unusual situation. A well dry during one quarter could provide data the following quarter. In any event, SMCRA allows for dynamic monitoring, such that OSMRE may suggest new monitoring locations based on review of quarterly monitoring reports. Adaptive management and adjustments to the program are within the purview of OSMRE in administering the SMCRA permit.</p> <p>22. Reference has been corrected to Table 4.5-5. Cottonwood and No Name data has been added to Table 4.5-5.</p> <p>23. The Draft EIS used the best available site-specific data to evaluate potential impacts.</p> <p>24. see response to 307.097</p> <p>25. The Navajo Nation does not have groundwater quality standards. The surface water quality standards are compared to the monitoring results to provide a point of comparison. As stated in the Final EIS impact analysis, potential impacts to current and future water uses from CCR placement at the Navajo Mine are minor.</p> <p>26. Reclamation includes post-mining groundwater monitoring. The bond would be released only upon satisfactory completion of all SMCRA requirements. As stated in the comment, it is likely decades (or event centuries) before the groundwater begins to flow out of the mine spoils.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							<p>This length of time allows for the natural attenuation of contaminants of concern. Further, at the point that the groundwater does begin flowing outward, any remaining contaminants would be attenuated to levels well below any concentrations that would be harmful; therefore, impacts would be minor.</p> <p>27. see above response</p>
307.094	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>e. The DEIS fails to accurately present the risk of harm from coal ash dam failures.</p> <p>The DEIS states, “[o]ne of the potential impacts from the disposal of CCR is an accidental release of the ash disposal surface impoundments at the FCPP. Based on this assessment of the dam, impacts from the potential accidental release would be minor.” DEIS at p. 4.11-23. This conclusion is arbitrary and capricious because it fails to present a complete and accurate assessment of the risk of dam failure. In 2008, the New Mexico Office of the State Engineer commented that the coal ash dams at the FCPP should be classified as High Hazard Potential dams (URS letter to NM OSE at 1 (June 23, 2011) (attached as Exhibit 56). APS responded by acknowledging that at least three residences were identified for evacuation because they were located within close proximity of the inundation area that would be affected by a breach of the coal ash dams (Id.). These facts were not identified in the DEIS. DEIS at 4.15-15. OSM’s characterization of the impact of dam failure as “minor” is arbitrary and capricious in light of the admissions by APS that three residences are at risk for death and destruction in the event of coal dam failure. This risk will only increase as the volume of coal ash waste increase over the next 40 years thus expanding the area of inundation and increasing the risk of death and destruction. The DEIS fails to assess this reasonably foreseeable risk.</p>	<p>The citation from 4.11-23 (Environmental Justice) does not adequately summarize the analysis in Section 4.15.1 (Hazardous and Solid Waste) from which it is drawn. In the primary chapter for this topic, 4.15, the EIS summarizes an EPA site assessment of the dam safety of FCPP’s LAI embankment dam. The dam was given a hazard potential classification, which is a rating for a dam based on the potential consequences of failure. The FCPP was given a hazard potential classification of significant hazard potential in the report. Dams assigned the significant hazard potential classification are those dams where failure or misoperation results in no probable loss of human life but can cause economic loss, environmental damage, or disruption of lifeline facilities, or can result in other concerns.</p> <p>In addition to the hazard potential classification the EPA inspection rated the condition of the impoundments as “satisfactory,” “fair,” “poor,” or “unsatisfactory,” terms commonly used in the field of dam safety. The site assessment for the FCPP rated all of the ash impoundments as satisfactory, which states, “no existing or potential management unit safety deficiencies are recognized. Acceptable performance is expected under all applicable loading conditions (static, hydrologic, seismic) in accordance with the applicable criteria.</p> <p>Because the condition was satisfactory and acceptable performance is expected under all applicable loading conditions, the analysis found that compliance with the developed plans and all regulatory requirements would address the potential for an accidental release. Therefore, the analysis concluded that the impacts would be minor.</p> <p>The citation from 4.11-23 has been re-written to improve clarity as follows:</p> <p>“[o]ne of the potential impacts from the disposal of CCR is an accidental release of the ash disposal surface impoundments at the FCPP. Based on the rated condition of the dam and regulatory compliance requirements, the likelihood of a release is low and therefore the impacts would be minor.”</p>
307.095	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>f. The DEIS fails to submit complete scientific information on the effects of CCW disposal practices at Navajo Mine.</p> <p>From 1971 until 2008, CCW was disposed of in unlined pits at the Navajo Mine. DEIS at 4.15-7. As noted above, CCW includes numerous toxins; OSM has calculated the “Navajo Mine On- site Land Disposal Release of Toxic Release Inventory Chemicals,” to include at least</p>	<p>The comment is addressing two separate issues. With regard to the Navajo Mine CCR placement, the data and analysis shows that impacts are minor see response . The recommended mitigation measure described on page 4.15-31 is in reference to CCR disposal at the FCPP; however this mitigation measure has been removed following publication of the Final Rule for CCR in December 2014. The regulation is self-</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p>between 1,532,872 and 2,147,990 pounds each year of toxic chemicals in CCW between 2002 and 2007, including arsenic, barium, lead, mercury, selenium, and thallium. DEIS at 4.15-7-8. OSM admits that the impacts of the placement of CCW in Navajo Mine are “unknown.” DEIS at 4.15-31. OSM does know, however, that at two of the pits where CCW was placed have become saturated with groundwater. DEIS at 4.15-31. Despite the fact that OSM does know that CCW contains large amounts of toxic materials, but admits that the impacts of storage of these toxins in unlined pits saturated with groundwater are unknown, OSM nevertheless comes to the conclusion that “potential impacts of CCRs in Navajo Mine were minor.” DEIS at 4.15-18. OSM’s unsupported conclusion about an issue of such great magnitude does not constitute the hard look required by NEPA.</p>	<p>implementing and applies to the disposal of CCR generated from coal-fired generating stations, including tribal lands. The rule includes provisions for dust control and groundwater monitoring. The regulation does not extend to placement of CCR in mines. The Final EIS has been updated accordingly to reflect the Final Rule and its applicability to CCR disposal at the FCPP. A comprehensive discussion of the rule, its provisions, and enforceability is provided in Section 4.15, Hazardous Materials and Wastes. In addition, specific provisions of the rule that apply to other resource areas (i.e. water and air) are included in Sections 4.1, 4.5, 4.11, and 4.18.</p>
307.096	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		<p>The DEIS claims that springs and seeps in the Region of Influence (ROI) are associated with Navajo Agricultural Products Industry (NAPI) and discounts the presence of natural springs/seeps based on BHP studies.</p> <p>No springs or seeps have been observed during hydrologic investigations conducted within or adjacent to the ROI (BNCC, 2012a). However, springs and seeps do occur along upper Chinde Wash, above the Navajo Mine Lease boundary. These springs and seeps are due to Navajo Agricultural Products (NAPI) irrigation return flows</p> <p>DEIS at 4.5-9. The DEIS then states that:</p> <p>Unsaturated conditions currently exist at CCR backfill placement locations except for two locations at the northern end of Area 1. CCR materials placed in the Bitsui Pit are saturated as are an isolated location of basal saturation of CCR material around the Watson-4 well. Current groundwater flow directions from the Bitsui Pit are toward the subcrop of the Fruitland Formation along the alluvium of the San Juan River (BNCC 2011a). Any groundwater flow in the future from Area I and portions of Area II is also expected to be to the northeast toward Fruitland Formation subcrop along the alluvium of the San Juan River. Consequently, groundwater from CCR placement locations and associated mine backfill within Areas I and II are not expected to affect the alluvium of the Chaco River.</p> <p>OSM’s assertion that groundwater is not affecting Chaco River alluvium is contradicted by impacts seen in the San Juan River, which the Chaco River feeds. The DEIS discloses that the San Juan River is listed as impaired for sedimentation and turbidity between the Animas River and Largo Canyon and that the Navajo Lake on the San Juan River is impaired for mercury in fish tissue. DEIS at 4.5-21. The DEIS fails to disclose many more waterways on the Navajo Nation that have mercury contamination.</p>	<p>As discussed on pages 4.5-9 and 4.5-10, little groundwater is present beneath the Navajo Mine lease area. To further clarify a sentence has been added stating that groundwater that is present is perched (not connected to a regional aquifer). It is for this reason that the Draft EIS states that “impacts to groundwater flow within the permit area would be expected to be moderate due to the long rate of groundwater recovery” on page 4.5-43. Further, with regard to groundwater quality, as stated on page 4.5-44 “modeling...showed it is unlikely that any detrimental future effect will occur from past CCR placement. This is due to the very slow groundwater movement and the attenuation of contaminants of concern as they percolate through the subsurface.”</p> <p>As such, by the time the groundwater flows rebound to natural conditions in these perched areas, any contaminants of concern from the coal combustion residue would have naturally attenuated. Therefore, additional groundwater monitoring beyond the bond release period of the SMCRA permit was not recommended in the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response #4, Mercury Deposition and Mercury in Fish in Nearby Lakes.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
307.097	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>OSM relies upon several assumptions to reach its faulty conclusion that CCW disposal does not present any potential impacts. First, it asserts that unsaturated conditions exist in most of the CCW disposal areas. However, as noted by the report done by Geo-Hydro, the unsaturated conditions may not exist permanently:</p> <p>groundwater modeling conducted in support of the Navajo Mine SMCRA permit indicates that groundwater gradients are expected to inward toward the mine pit for many decades following mine closure. Adverse impacts of CCR disposal will not likely become evident until groundwater within the mine spoil has rebounded to the point that lateral migration of impacted groundwater out of the spoil and into surrounding areas is reasonably expected (Expert Report of Geo-Hydro (attached as Exhibit 54).</p> <p>Thus, OSM’s assumption that there will be no impacts rests on the conceit that just because there are no impacts presently, there will be no impacts in the future. OSM must consider future conditions in its analysis of impacts from the disposal of huge amounts of toxic materials. As noted by Geo-Hydro:</p> <p>Unfortunately for the residents of the Navajo Nation groundwater modeling performed in support of the Area IV North mine plan significant revision application (BNCC, 2011) showed that groundwater gradients will be inward toward the mine backfill for as long as 80 years before resaturation of the mine spoils will progress to the point that groundwater will possibly begin to flow out of the mine spoils. Since environmental monitoring programs are routinely terminated and bonds released soon after completion of mine reclamation, the monitoring system needed to evaluate whether predictions of minimal impacts to water quality are correct will no longer be in place at the time and place where data will be needed (Id.).</p>	<p>The Geo-Hydro report is correct that groundwater modeling indicates groundwater gradients are expected to flow inward toward the mine pit following reclamation. As discussed on pages 4.5-9 and 4.5-10, little groundwater is present beneath the Navajo Mine lease area. To further clarify a sentence has been added stating that groundwater that is present is perched (not connected to a regional aquifer). It is for this reason that the Draft EIS states that “impacts to groundwater flow within the permit area would be expected to be moderate due to the long rate of groundwater recovery” on page 4.5-43. Further, with regard to groundwater quality, as stated on page 4.5-44 “modeling...showed it is unlikely that any detrimental future effect will occur from past CCR placement. This is due to the very slow groundwater movement and the attenuation of contaminants of concern as they percolate through the subsurface.”</p> <p>As such, by the time the groundwater flows rebound to natural conditions in these perched areas, any contaminants of concern from the CCR would have naturally attenuated. Therefore, additional groundwater monitoring beyond the bond release period of the SMCRA permit was not recommended in the Draft EIS.</p>
307.098	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>OSM’s next attempt to explain away any impacts rests on a supplemental groundwater study program and laboratory batch testing (performed by BHP) that was implemented to assess possible impacts to groundwater from historic CCW disposal. However, Geo-Hydro’s report again reveals the problems with reliance upon this study:</p> <p>The DEIS concludes that TDS and sulfate concentrations do not increase in concentration and that other metals are attenuated in water that flows from CCR placement areas through spoils. The conclusions of this section of the DEIS are at best speculative and likely wrong for the following reasons.</p> <p>The supplemental groundwater study consisted of installation and monitoring of wells completed upgradient, downgradient, and within CCR that has been disposed in the mine. The DEIS states that TDS and sulfate concentrations do not increase in CCR that become saturated with spoil water. The analytical results from sampling of both spoil and CCR wells show very high concentrations of TDS and sulfate. These results do</p>	<p>OSMRE conducted a technical review of the National Research Council Report and provided the following response to the suggestion that there should be improvements to the current leachate protocol: It is the responsibility of the permit applicant to demonstrate that the operational handling plan, reclamation plan, and monitoring program provide sufficient technical support so that the State Regulatory Authority can make the finding that all SMCRA water quality performance standards will be met. The State Regulatory Authority must determine whether certain leachate criteria must be met in order to ensure that the SMCRA water quality performance standards can be met. Because of the broad range of climatic and geologic settings and mining technologies where these materials are placed, the author believes that general statements like “Samples that exceed pre-determined leaching criteria should be rejected for mine placement” ignore the need for State specific expertise and responsibility for determining the measures necessary to meet SMCRA performance standards. The leaching tests referred to in the analysis provided on page 4.5-45 of the Draft EIS is analyzing the</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p>not indicate that CCR does not leach these parameters to water when saturated, rather it shows that the concentrations of TDS and sulfate are so high in the spoil wells that they approach those of CCR leachate.</p> <p>Analytical results from monitoring points completed in CCR showed increased concentrations of arsenic, boron, fluoride and selenium. The study cites dispersion and bacterially mediated sulfate reduction to explain why the concentrations of the elevated metals is lower in wells located downgradient of the ash. Missing however is any discussion of the distance and depth of the downgradient wells relative to the CCR, the site specific rate and direction (lateral and vertical) of groundwater flow between the CCR source and downgradient wells; and the size, location, and orientation of the migrating CCR contaminant plumes. Sample analyses only document groundwater quality changes if wells are located and constructed in the correct location and screened intervals are set at the correct depth to intercept the contaminant plume. It is not clear from the provided discussion whether the CCR-derived contaminants had sufficient time to travel the distance to the downgradient monitoring wells. The ability of the monitoring system to detect and characterize the range of contaminants migrating downgradient of the mine spoils must be evaluated and discussed if conclusions drawn from the data are to be relied upon.</p> <p>Application of short duration, low solid-ratio (dilute) leaching tests like those cited in this section of the DEIS and discussed more fully in Area IV North Permit Application (BNCC, 2011) routinely underestimate the concentration of contaminants in flyash-derived leachate. The procedure does not allow ash constituents sufficient time to come into equilibrium with the fluid, the solid- water ratio is far more dilute than under disposal conditions, and the laboratory conditions do not represent the disposal conditions under which leachate will actually form. The National Research Council warned of the inadequacy of laboratory characterization tests as surrogates for determining field leachate composition specifically with respect to CCR in their investigation of coal combustion ash disposal in mined settings (National Research Council, 2006). These tests were not designed or intended to represent predictions of leachate that will form in the field, and to use them as such is inappropriate (National Research Council, p. 123 et seq.). Citing decades old results from outmoded tests that are widely acknowledged to be ineffective at predicting leachate concentrations from saturated CCR calls into question the validity of the entire evaluation of current and potential future environmental impacts (Id.).</p>	<p>potential for impacts from mine spoils, not placement of CCR at the mine. At this mine, this leaching test is predictive and compares well with the data for the wells within the CCR placement area; therefore, it does effectively measure leaching at this mine.</p>
307.099	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>OSM also tries to explain away impacts by asserting that dilution of groundwater flow will alleviate impacts. DEIS at 4.5-17. Again, however, Geo-Hydro explains that OSM's conclusions are in error:</p> <p>The DEIS cites dilution by the larger volume of groundwater flow in river alluvium to support the claim of no adverse impacts to surface water quality from CCR or mine spoil constituents that eventually</p>	<p>As stated in the Draft EIS, the groundwater quality within the Navajo Mine lease area (in both areas that are actively mined and those that have not yet been mined) exceed the criteria for livestock watering (which is based on surface water quality standards since the Navajo Nation does not have groundwater quality standards or designated beneficial uses for groundwater); however, as shown on Figure 4.5-1, there are no livestock watering wells within Areas I and II. As described in the EIS, historic</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p>discharge from the Fruitland Formation to the alluvium along the San Juan River. The marginal quality of the water for its current use indicates that there is very little room for addition of Navajo Mine or FCPP-related contaminants without causing material damage to the hydrologic balance by eliminating livestock watering as a future use of groundwater in areas surrounding the permit area Id.).</p> <p>This point is of particular importance given the concerns enumerated above that we simply do not have water to spare to pollution in New Mexico presently, and certainly not with drought conditions becoming more frequent with changes in our climate.</p>	<p>and current livestock watering in the vicinity of the permit area has been limited to surface and alluvial systems. Groundwater monitoring data does not indicate that CCR disposal has compromised groundwater quality for livestock use in Area I or II. Rather groundwater monitoring data shows that baseline/background Fruitland and PCS water quality has never meet livestock criteria and has never been used for livestock watering. Additionally, the limited data available in the Bitsui alluvium which has been used historically for livestock watering indicates that water quality upgradient of all historic mining and CCR placement was of marginal quality for livestock use. Therefore, the only anticipated future use of groundwater in the area is for oil and gas purposes. The EIS has been revised to provide this explanation as well. In addition, review of baseline monitoring wells in Areas IVN and IVS indicate that water quality in the alluvium and Fruitland Formation is not suitable for livestock watering.</p> <p>As described in Section 4.5 of the Draft EIS, the slow movement of groundwater would allow for the attenuation of contaminants of concern from mine spoil constituents and CCR over time. As such, modeling conducted for the project has indicated that there would be little to no change in existing groundwater quality as a result of the project. OSMRE has reviewed the modeling methods and results presented and agrees with the conclusions. Site-specific groundwater monitoring has directly demonstrated that there is no contamination attributable to CCR storage at the mine, thus validating the model results.</p>
307.100						<p>Although groundwater now may be used only for livestock watering, that water may become necessary to treat for higher uses, including agricultural, domestic, and other uses in the future. Dismissing adding additional pollution to groundwater just because it is not being used now is irresponsible and illegal. “[I]f the existing concentration of any water contaminant in groundwater exceeds the [groundwater] standards . . . no degradation of the groundwater beyond the existing concentration will be allowed.” NMAC 20.6.2.3101.A.2. As the New Mexico Court of Appeals found: “[c]ertainly, the legislature meant to capture the concept that clean water that is currently being withdrawn for use, or clean water that is likely to be used in the reasonably foreseeable future, must be protected.” Phelps Dodge Tyrone, Inc. v. New Mexico Water Quality Control Comm’n, 143 P.3d 502, 509 (NM Ct. App. 2006). A Commissioner on the Water Quality Control Commission put it more simply: “we are darn sure obligated to make sure that the water that isn’t contaminated outside of [the currently contaminated] area is protected.” Id. The Commissioner’s comment seems to state the obvious, and yet OSM has ignored this obvious obligation by failing to take a hard look at whether historic CCW disposal will cause further deterioration of groundwater, regardless of whether that groundwater is presently of the highest quality, or if it is presently used only for livestock watering.</p>	<p>The Navajo Nation does not have groundwater quality standards or designate beneficial uses for groundwater on the Navajo Nation. As stated on page 4.5-17, “water derived...in the vicinity of the FCPP and Navajo Mine is predominantly used for livestock watering, therefore, alluvial water quality is compared to the applicable livestock water [surface water] criteria. The criteria are not enforceable standards with respect to groundwater and are included only as a reference for the suitability of the groundwater quality for livestock use.”</p> <p>With regard to a hard look, please see Master Response #1. Analysis of potential impacts to groundwater quality in the vicinity of the Navajo Mine is addressed on pages 4.5-43 and 4.5-57. As stated in the Draft EIS, the groundwater quality within the Navajo Mine lease area (in both areas that are actively mined and those that have not yet been mined) exceed the criteria for livestock watering; however, as shown on Figure 4.5-1, there are no livestock watering wells within Areas I and II.</p> <p>As described in the EIS, historic and current livestock watering in the vicinity of the permit area has been limited to surface and alluvial systems. Groundwater monitoring data does not indicate that CCR disposal has compromised groundwater quality for livestock use in Area I or II. Rather groundwater monitoring data shows that baseline/background Fruitland and PCS water quality has never meet livestock criteria and has never been used for livestock watering.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							Additionally, the limited data available in the Bitsui alluvium which has been used historically for livestock watering indicates that water quality upgradient of all historic mining and CCR placement was of marginal quality for livestock use. Therefore, the only anticipated future use of groundwater in the area is for oil and gas purposes. The EIS has been revised to provide this explanation as well. In addition, review of baseline monitoring wells in Areas IVN and IVS indicate that water quality in the alluvium and Fruitland Formation is not suitable for livestock watering.
307.101						In sum, OSM has failed to take a hard look at the disposal of enormous amounts of hazardous materials into unlined mine pits. OSM must obtain additional information about current conditions, and present further modeling of future conditions before it can reach any conclusions about impacts.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
307.102	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	The DEIS states at several points that consultation with the FWS under section 7 has begun or is imminent. DEIS at 4.8-1, 5-4. The analysis of special status species issues in Sections 4.8 and 4.18 of the DEIS, however, appear to rely on erroneous legal and factual assumptions and methodologies in an effort to obscure or downplay the effects of continued FCPP operations on listed species and their critical habitat. For OSM to meet its obligations under section 7(a)(2) to ensure that federal actions do not jeopardize listed species or adversely modify their critical habitat, it must address and rectify these errors and omissions, as detailed below.	Additional information has been added in numerous places in the EIS to clarify the role of future emissions from FCPP to species within the deposition area and in the San Juan River watershed, based on the completion of consultation with the USFWS. At the project level, impacts are minor based on the ecological risk assessments conducted. Ecological risks are present under existing conditions and would remain and increase, with or without the project. The future operation of FCPP would not substantially increase these risks. The conclusions of the Final EIS are based on comparison of the project effect to the existing baseline, as present at the time the NOP for the EIS was published. ESA consultation was conducted as a separate but parallel process to the NEPA process, with a separate biological assessment and biological opinion that address ESA requirements. The results of the ESA consultation have been incorporated into the Final EIS and the Biological Opinion is added as an appendix to the EIS.
307.103	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	In particular, as will be discussed in detail below the DEIS relies improperly on two arguments to contend that FCPP mercury and selenium emissions are “insignificant” or “minor” in their impacts to listed fish and birds. First, it contends, misleadingly, that FCPP emissions alone are insufficient to cause risk to listed individuals or populations, ignoring the fact that those emissions, and resulting deposition of mercury and selenium, impact waterways and aquatic food webs already sufficiently impacted to cause harm to substantial proportions of listed fish within the San Juan River. DEIS 4.8-69. This overly-narrow definition of risk ignores the fact that Section 7 analyses must consider baseline conditions in the action area – “[t]he baseline includes State, tribal, local, and private actions already affecting the species or that will occur contemporaneously with the consultation in progress,” (United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Endangered Species Consultation Handbook 4-22) and that, by its own admission, “metals concentrations under current conditions alone appears to pose a risk to ecological	The analysis in the Draft EIS is based upon the NEPA definition of baseline conditions, not those under ESA Section 7. Under NEPA, the baseline concentrations of mercury, selenium and other chemicals of potential concern (COPECs) are those already present in the environment when the EIS NOP was published. As noted in the Draft EIS, those concentrations were at levels that indicate that there may be some risk from these COPEC to listed or candidate species. This risk already exists whether or not the FCPP NMEP continues to operate into the future. The effects of the ongoing operation of the project (the action being considered in the EIS) were evaluated based on its future contributions of COPECs to the environment. The ERA models project that these future contributions will be very small, relative to baseline conditions (three to five orders of magnitude less than existing concentrations), and that these future contributions will not substantively affect the risk these baseline chemical concentrations plus future contributions from sources other than FCPP pose to sensitive species in the future.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						receptors within the deposition area as well as in the San Juan River downstream of the deposition area,” DEIS 4.18-48.	The discussion of the risks posed by COPECs has been expanded to clarify how future operations would affect concentrations of COPECs and the risk they pose to listed species. The conclusion in the Draft EIS that these risks are minimal is supported by the available data.
307.104	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>Second, the DEIS, where it does discuss endangered fish toxicity, in its discussion of cumulative impacts, it dismisses the risk from FCPP emissions because toxicity risks to aquatic species such as the Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker are predicted to remain high from other sources, “but this risk would remain with or without the future operation of FCPP.” DEIS 4.1-49. It then goes on to argue that because pollution controls would reduce FCPP toxic metals emissions from current levels, FCPP’s incremental contribution to the species’ impairment is only “moderate.”</p> <p>As a result of the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable emissions from power plants in the region, as well as other sources of emissions (e.g., coal burned in private homes), the potential exists for cumulatively major impacts to aquatic species, such as the pike minnow and razorback sucker. However, as modeled in the two ERAs described above, the contribution of FCPP to this potential cumulative effect would be significantly less than historic conditions, and still represent a decline over baseline emissions. Consequently, the long-term contribution of FCPP to cumulative impacts to threatened and endangered species is considered moderate.</p> <p>DEIS 4.18-49. What is missing from this analysis is any support for the “consequently.” The fact that FCPP mercury emissions will likely decrease with the addition of best available retrofit technology does not excuse the DEIS from providing sufficient information to allow the public and decision-makers to compare continued FCPP operation (even with emissions reductions) with the no-action alternative (no FCPP operation). The unsupported conclusion that FCPP’s contribution will be only “moderate” appears to represent an effort to excuse FCPP’s adverse impacts, not to meet the agency’s NEPA and ESA Section 7 obligations to take a hard look at what the incremental and cumulative effects of its actions will actually be.</p>	Tables showing the risk associated with COPECs under baseline conditions and with and without the future operation of FCPP were added to the EIS. These tables show that the contributions of COPECs from future operation of the plant are several orders of magnitude lower than those already in the environment or those expected to be contributed over the life of the project from other sources. As such, future contributions of COPECs from the plant will not appreciably increase risks of these COPECs to biological resources over the life of the project.
307.105	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>By generally confining its “action area” to a “one mile buffer” around the mine and half-mile buffer around transmission lines, OSM arbitrarily limits its analysis of impacts to listed species – in contravention to its ESA mandate.</p> <p>The DEIS defines its “Region of Influence” (“ROI”) as “the lease boundary for the Navajo Mine and FCPP, with an additional 1-mile buffer. For the transmission lines, the ROI is a one-half mile buffer outside each side of the ROW boundary.” DEIS 4-8.1. It also includes an additional area of analysis for FCPP emissions deposited on land or water outside this limited ROI. At one point, the DEIS states that “For the FCPP, the ROI also includes the deposition area around the plant</p>	<p>The ROI for biological resources includes the FCPP and Navajo Mine Lease Areas, including a 1 mile buffer around those lease areas, the transmission line ROWs, and a ½ mile buffer around those ROWs. These areas capture the physical disturbance to species associated with activities in those project areas, with the buffers providing protection for individuals living in proximity to those areas.</p> <p>The effects of emissions from FCPP are considered within the area where a baseline concentrations would be increased by more than 1 percent by the cumulative future emissions from FCPP over the life of the project (referred to as the Deposition Area), as predicted by CALPUFF and described in the Deposition Area ERA. CALPUFF was applied within a</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p>within which 99 percent of all [constituents of potential ecological concern] emitted from the plant are projected to the ground or water.” Id. This definition of the analysis area, however, does not appear to find any support either elsewhere in the EIS or in the two APS-generated “Ecological Risk Assessments” on which it heavily relies for its conclusions. Those analyses look instead at “the area identified by air dispersion modeling as having a 1 percent future increase in soil metals concentrations above current condition (baseline) metals concentrations,” (DEIS 4.8-69, citing AECOM, Four Corners Plant and Navajo Mine Energy Project Ecological Risk Assessment (2013) (“Deposition ERA”) or “the aquatic environment of the San Juan River basin, both within the deposition area and downstream of the deposition area into the San Juan River arm of Lake Powell” (DEIS 4.8-69, citing AECOM, San Juan River Ecological Risk Assessment Conducted in Support of the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine Energy Project (2013) (“San Juan River ERA”). It appears that the Deposition ERA limited its analysis of deposition impacts to a 50 km radius around FCPP based on the following reasoning:</p> <p>The ERA Deposition Area, shown with the red outline in Figure 2-1, was determined by delineating the area where the predicted incremental increase in soil concentration of any of the metals due to 25 years of future full load plant operations is projected to be more than 1% of current concentrations (based on the PLUTO data). Beyond this area, the very small increase in soil concentration associated with the Proposed Action would be sufficiently low to be considered discountable.</p> <p>Deposition ERA 2-5 (citation omitted). These predicted increases in soil concentration, used to limit the area of analysis, appear to be derived from estimates of EPA’s CALPUFF model for large-scale atmospheric deposition, compared to general soil samples from San Juan county from the 1960s through 1990s. See Deposition ERA at 2-4 to 2-5. This method of limiting the analysis area, however, fails to take into account either the Fish and Wildlife Service’s use of a 300 km radius for assessing coal plant deposition impacts (See U.S. Dep’t of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Draft Biological Opinion for the Desert Rock Energy Project, U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Gallup, New Mexico at 9-10 (Oct. 2009) [hereinafter “Desert Rock BiOp”] (attached as Exhibit 163 to Conservation Groups’ scoping comments), or the existence of a detailed site-specific study showing that sources of mercury deposition at Mesa Verde National Park include coal-fired power plants between 55 and 321 km from the Park (See Mountain Studies Institute, Sources of Atmospheric Mercury Concentrations and Wet Deposition at Mesa Verde National Park, Southwestern Colorado, 2002-08, Report 2010-03 at 4, 19 (2010) [hereinafter “MSI Report”] (attached as Exhibit 168 to Conservation Groups’ scoping comments).</p> <p>In determining the “action area” for air emission-related impacts from FCPP, the FWS and OSM should include, at a minimum, a 300 km radius from FCPP just as FWS employed in the Desert Rock Biological</p>	<p>300 km radius of the FCPP. Also included is the portion of the San Juan River from the upstream boundary of the Deposition Area, downstream to and including the San Juan Arm of Lake Powell, which may be affected by transport of COPECs by the San Juan River to these downstream areas. This has been clarified in the EIS.</p> <p>Based on the atmospheric models used, and the subsequent ERAs, the ROI defined for atmospheric emissions encompasses the area for which the project has any likelihood of increasing the risk posed by chemicals in the environment.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						Opinion (“Desert Rock BiOp”). This is because FCPP and the proposed Desert Rock Energy Project would have been located adjacent to one another, they would have burned coal from the same mine, and similar impacts to the same listed species and critical habitats could be anticipated from both facilities’ operations.	
307.106	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	In addition to the 300 km air emission radius, the action area should include all lands directly, indirectly and cumulatively affected by all facets of the proposed action, including coal mining, coal combustion, transportation and transmission corridors.	<p>The ROI for biological resources includes the FCPP and Navajo Mine Lease Areas, including a 1 mile buffer around those lease areas, the transmission line ROWs, and a ½ mile buffer around those ROWs. These areas capture the physical disturbance to species associated with activities in those project areas, with the buffers providing protection for individuals living in proximity to those areas.</p> <p>The effects of emissions from FCPP are considered within the area where a baseline concentrations would be increased by more than 1 percent by the cumulative future emissions from FCPP over the life of the project (referred to as the Deposition Area), as predicted by CALPUFF and described in the Deposition Area ERA. CALPUFF was applied within a 300 km radius of the FCPP. Also included is the portion of the San Juan River from the upstream boundary of the Deposition Area, downstream to and including the San Juan Arm of Lake Powell, which may be affected by transport of COPECs by the San Juan River to these downstream areas. This has been clarified in the EIS.</p> <p>Based on the atmospheric models used, and the subsequent ERAs, the ROI defined for atmospheric emissions encompasses the area for which the project has any likelihood of increasing the risk posed by chemicals in the environment.</p>
307.107	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	The DEIS goes to considerable effort, however, to try to minimize the reasonably foreseeable impacts to listed species, particularly aquatic and avian species, adversely affected by toxic emissions from the FCPP, both from stack air emissions and from the leaching of coal combustion waste into ground and potentially surface water. In its cumulative effects analysis, the DEIS acknowledges that “metals concentrations under current conditions alone appears to pose a risk to ecological receptors within the deposition area as well as in the San Juan River downstream of the deposition area.” DEIS 4.18-48. It then declines to quantify or even characterize the role of FCPP emissions in this risk, though, apparently relying either on predicted declines in emissions under BART controls, or on potential increases in mercury from Chinese emissions, to dismiss the significance of FCPP’s contribution. These excuses are not consistent with the fundamental purpose of the cumulative effects analysis.	The Final EIS includes tables showing the concentrations of COPECs whose cumulative concentrations result in a hazard quotient exceeding 1. These tables include concentrations and HQs from baseline, future FCPP contributions, and future contributions from other regional and global sources.
307.108	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		Despite these efforts in the special status species section to minimize the contribution of FCPP to adverse effects on listed species, other portions of the DEIS, and the EPRI study, make clear that its role is substantial. According to the EPRI baseline scenario modeling results, the maximum contribution of FCPP mercury emissions to mercury total deposition is	As reported in Section 4.8, EPRI reports that their modeling indicates that under baseline conditions, FCPP contributed from 2 to a maximum of 28% southeast of the plant of the total mercury deposition in the basin. Their modeling indicated that their post-2014 scenario indicated a reduced area of deposition, with a maximum contribution of up to 15%

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						about 28 percent in San Juan County near the FCPP and contributions from FCPP range from 2 to 28 percent in the vicinity of the plant; however, the contributions from FCPP are less than 2 percent over the remainder of the San Juan basin (EPRI 2013).” DEIS 4.1-61. What the DEIS and ERAs fail to disclose, however, is the relative contribution of FCPP to mercury deposition, bioavailability, and bioaccumulation within the San Juan’s aquatic ecosystems and food web. Without this basic information, there is no way to assess whether the DEIS’s claims of “minor” “moderate” or “insignificant” impacts are validated.	of the total deposition in some areas. Note that these maximum contributions are only for some areas southeast of FCPP (away from the San Juan River) and not across the entire watershed. They go on to say that total mercury contributions from the three plants they model (FCPP, San Juan Generating Station and Navajo Generating Station) contribute to total mercury deposition at four locations, Lake Powell (AZ and UT), Shiprock, and Navajo Lake range from 1% at Navajo Lake to 4% at the other stations. EPRI further reports that contributions of the three plants to selenium deposition is “negligible”. From this deposition, EPRI goes on to model the fate and transport of mercury through the watershed and into the San Juan River, and into Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. This analysis includes various physical and biological processes, including bioaccumulation. The ERAs then use the values predicted by the EPRI models to determine potential effects to biological resources. For mercury in Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker, the ERAs rely on EPRI’s modeling for those species. For other species, the ERAs used the EPRI model’s predicted concentrations in soils, sediment and water along with peer-reviewed uptake factors (e.g., bioaccumulation factors) to determine endpoint concentrations of mercury and selenium and assess the risk to those biological resources. The results of this modeling is incorporated into Sections 4.6, 4.7, 4.8, and 4.18, as appropriate.
307.109	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>Neither the DEIS nor either of the ERAs even attempts to provide such quantitative assessment of probable levels of reproductive impairment. The Deposition ERA, acknowledging risks to fish from mercury and selenium, goes on to state that “Although risks to mobile adult fish are likely overestimated by the [critical body residues “CBRs”], and in particular by the [No Observed Effect Concentration] CBRs, the potential for risks to sensitive life stages and listed species cannot be ruled out.” Deposition ERA at 7-4 (emphasis added).</p> <p>Given OSM’s and FWS’s obligations to avoid jeopardy and contribute to the recovery of listed species under the ESA, it is not sufficient for the DEIS to conclude that “risks exist with or without continued FCPP operation.” Rather, it must actually take a hard look at what the levels of harm, including reproductive and other sublethal effects, under all scenarios (including comparing FCPP operation and closure), against a baseline that includes existing conditions and other local, regional, and global sources and in full light of the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to species over the full 50-year lifetime of the power plant, and the additional 25 years of operations contemplated by the DEIS.</p>	As described in the response to Comment 307.116, modeling conducted indicates that these future operations will not contribute substantially to the risks from mercury and other COPECs. Cumulatively, the concentrations of mercury and selenium are expected to increase over the baseline, which is already at levels that may cause harmful effects to listed species. These increases are due in small part to FCPP emissions, as discussed in the EIS and described above, but in greater part due to contributions from other regional and global sources. As discussed in a previous response and in the Draft EIS, the future operation of FCPP would not add substantively to this risk. If FCPP were to shut down in 2016, the risk to species from these contaminants would be nearly identical to that posed by continued operation of the plant.
307.110	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>Furthermore, while risks may certainly exist with or without continued FCPP operation, the DEIS should consider, via comparative analysis of the impacts of various alternatives, including an alternative that would consider the consequences of not allowing post-2016 coal operations, what the reduction in risk to the species would be. That reduction in risk may warrant retirement of the coal complex well before 25 years are up.</p>	Tables showing the risk associated with COPECs under baseline conditions and with and without the future operation of FCPP have been added to the Final EIS. These tables show that the contributions of COPECs from future operation of the plant are several orders of magnitude lower than those already in the environment or those expected to be contributed over the life of the project from other sources. As such,

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							future contributions of COPECs from the plant would not appreciably increase risks of these COPECs to biological resources over the life of the project. The No Action Alternative address the consequences of not allowing post 2016 coal operations. With regard to other alternatives considered, please see Master Response #3, Shorter Lease Term.
307.111	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	The DEIS acknowledges, but does not analyze at all, the fact that releases are occurring from CCW disposal sites and that CCW leachate contains selenium. DEIS 4.5-14, 4.5-57. "Previous studies found two primary areas of groundwater seepage beneath the ash disposal areas, the "north seep" and "south seepage area" (APS 2013)."	The Draft EIS evaluates potential impacts from groundwater seepage on page 4.5-57 based on a statistical analysis which is described. Based on this analysis the Draft EIS states on page 4.5-57, "with operation of the intercept trenches, continued operation and expansion of the DFADAs would have less potential to contaminate local groundwater and water quality in Chaco Wash."
307.112	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	In reaching its conclusions in the Desert Rock BO, FWS relied on (1) muscle tissue samples ("plugs") collected from Colorado pikeminnow collected throughout the Upper Colorado River Basin, including within the San Juan River (Environmental Contaminants Data Management System (ECDMS) Catalogs, Hg in San Juan River Colorado Pikeminnow Muscle (obtained from Desert Rock BiOp record) (attached as Exhibit Exhibit 165 to Conservation Groups' scoping comments), (2) estimates of brain-tissue population-scale mercury concentrations derived from muscle-brain mercury tissue concentration ratios established in peer-reviewed literature (See Appendix E, Mercury concentrations in both brain and muscle tissues from fish toxicity studies (obtained from Desert Rock BiOp record) (attached as Exhibit 16g to Conservation Groups' scoping comments), (3) peer-reviewed brain tissue mercury concentration thresholds for reproductive impairment derived (Raw data on effects to Pikeminnow (obtained from Desert Rock BiOp record) (attached as Exhibit 167 to Conservation Groups' scoping comments). The DEIS should have been supported by similar reliance on actual physical evidence which the Desert Rock BO demonstrates are feasible and practical and essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives, not merely statistical models. See 40 C.F.R. §§ 1502.22(a), 1502.24.	Under NEPA, the primary analysis is the effect of the Proposed Action relative to the environmental baseline, followed by the cumulative impact analysis. Under Section 7 of ESA, the primary focus is on cumulative impact analysis. The data noted in the comments were used in the development of the Biological Assessment and supporting studies for the project.
307.113	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	Moreover, although the ERAs advocate consideration of "alternative" and more permissive thresholds for toxic exposure, the nevertheless acknowledge that the scientific-consensus exposure levels used in the Desert Rock BiOp are appropriate for listed species and sensitive life stages. Deposition ERA at 7-4.	The evaluation of impacts relied primarily on the scientific-consensus values described in the Desert Rock Energy Project BO, as identified in previous literature, where available, or on toxicity reference values approved by EPA when scientific consensus values were not available. This was clarified in Section 4.6 of the EIS where additional description of the EPRI model and ERA models was added.
307.114	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		Because, even under conservative estimates baseline mercury levels already exceed thresholds for reproductive impairment in a majority of individuals within Colorado pikeminnow, FCPP's past and ongoing mercury emissions already jeopardize Colorado pikeminnow by polluting the fish's critical habitat and preventing its survival and recovery. Because already-deposited mercury that has bio-accumulated in the San Juan River ecosystem will persist for decades, any future mercury emissions from FCPP will only worsen conditions for Colorado	A more complete discussion of the risks posed by the continued operation of FCPP is provided in the Final EIS. As described above, modeling conducted indicates that these future operations will not contribute substantially to the risks from mercury and other COPECs. Cumulatively, the concentrations of mercury and selenium are expected to increase over the baseline, which is already at levels that may cause harmful effects to listed species. These increases are due in small part to FCPP emissions, as discussed in the EIS and described above, but in

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						pikeminnow and other listed species. The fact that these species are already at risk does not excuse OSM from taking a hard look and disclosing the extent of, intensity of, and comparative effects of various alternatives on those risks.	greater part due to contributions from other regional and global sources. As discussed in a previous response and in the Draft EIS, the future operation of FCPP would not add substantively to this risk. If FCPP were to shut down in 2016, the risk to species from these contaminants would be nearly identical to that posed by continued operation of the plant.
307.115	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>d. The DEIS Mischaracterizes APS's Own Ecological Risk Analyses</p> <p>As a threshold matter, we object to the DEIS's decision to obscure the reasoning behind its conclusions by citing repeatedly and in a conclusory fashion to proprietary studies that are not disclosed to the public in the DEIS or its appendices. Failure to make public the assumptions and methodologies underlying its conclusions makes it very difficult – if not impossible – for the general public to understand or comment on OSM's analysis. Moreover, review of the two Ecological Risk Assessments reveals that the DEIS, at several points, either mischaracterizes their significance or omits critical conclusions and/or uncertainties in order to minimize the adverse affects of continued FCPP operations.</p> <p>The DEIS, in its analysis of cumulative impacts on special status species, states:</p> <p>In summary, regardless of the source of emissions, metals concentrations under current conditions alone appears to pose a risk to ecological receptors within the deposition area as well as in the San Juan River downstream of the deposition area. Because of the considerable uncertainty in predicting future regional and global metals emissions, future cumulative impacts to ecological resources may be best described by bounding potential impacts within the range of HQs reported for "Current Conditions + FCPP Only Contributions" and "Scenario 8 Contributions". Even at the lower range of HQs that assume status quo current conditions in combination with future FCPP emissions, several highly elevated HQs (e.g., HQ of 190 for selenium exposure to generic San Juan River aquatic receptors; HQs as high as 12 for mercury exposure to Colorado pikeminnow in the San Juan River; HQs as high as 71 for selenium exposure to early life stage fish in the San Juan River) indicate the potential for adverse effects to individual receptors, as well as potential for population level effects. Cumulative impacts associated with past, present, and future conditions may be substantial regardless of whether China mercury emissions increase in the future, but this risk would remain with or without the future operation of FCPP, and as indicated in the ERAs, its future operation would not meaningfully increase those risks. Therefore the contribution of future FCPP operations would not be cumulatively substantive with respect to these ecological risks. DEIS 4.18-48-49. This conclusion – that FCPP future operation would not meaningfully increase risks – is not supported by the actual methods and conclusions cited ERA. The "HQ" cited in the DEIS refers to a "hazard quotient," a method of determining whether a particular constituent of potential ecological concern ("COPEC") poses a risk to a specified biological receptor. San Juan ERA at 4-5. The actual</p>	<p>With regard to disclosure to the public, all references used in development of the EIS are part of the administrative record and available upon request.</p> <p>The Final EIS has been updated to provide greater description of the risks associated with the baseline conditions and how much the project will add to those risks. Section 4.18.3 has been revised to clarify how future contributions from other sources will add to that risk.</p> <p>The EPRI study and ERAs, habitat evaluations and other materials prepared by the applicants or their consultants underwent critical review by various entities including OSMRE, USFWS and other cooperating agencies prior to their acceptance for use in the EIS.</p> <p>The EIS has been revised to provide greater clarification of the reasoning behind its conclusions, as described for previous comments.</p> <p>The Draft EIS accurately characterizes the results of the ERA. The ERA shows that the FCPP, by itself does not result in HQs &gt; 1 for mercury or selenium, and in fact the HQs resulting from future operations of FCPP several orders of magnitude less than one, as previously described. Both the ERAs and the Draft EIS also identify that HQs resulting from the baseline condition indicate that levels of mercury and selenium are above the levels that may indicate risk to these species.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p>quotient in question refers to an exposure point concentration (“EPC”) divided by an ecological screening value (“ESV”). Id. at 4-1, 4-5. The DEIS relies on the fact that hazard quotients for mercury and selenium exposure would be extremely high even without future FCPP emissions to avoid engaging in any quantitative or even qualitative analysis of the incremental effects of either FCPP emissions or cumulative emissions on pikeminnow and sucker toxicity, mortality, reproduction, or recovery. The ERA makes clear, however, that the hazard quotient method is designed only to determine whether or not a risk exists (i.e. whether or not the HQ is greater than 1), and that it does not quantify or describe the scope or severity of that risk. See San Juan ERA at 6-19 to 6-20 (“The simple “HQ” approach provides a conservative measure of the potential for risk based on a “snapshot” of conditions and the hazard quotient approach has no predictive capability. HQs are measures of levels of concern, not measures of risk.”) (“The HQ is not a measure of risk . . . the HQ is not a population-based measure, HQs do not refer to the number of individuals or percentage of the exposed population that is expected to be impacted . . . HQs are not linearly scaled, the level of concern for a receptor with a HQ of 10 may not be twice the concern over a HQ of 5.”) Because risk does not scale linearly with HQ nor does HQ quantify the extent of potential population effects, the existence of extremely high HQs alone does not excuse OSM from at least making some reasoned attempt to quantify or otherwise describe the numbers of endangered fish that will be adversely affected both with and without FCPP, and to assess the resulting impacts on species survival and/or recovery.</p> <p>Interestingly, the DEIS’s discussion of vegetation impacts does acknowledge the significant limits of the ERAs approach, limits that are not acknowledged in its discussion of special status species nor cumulative impacts thereon:</p> <p>It is important to recognize that these ERAs do not directly address potential impacts to communities or populations, but rather address potential impacts to individuals. For generic ecological receptors population-level effects may be of greater relevance than impacts to individuals. Thus, potential risks to individuals are likely not representative of risks to populations; in general, for the same exposures, population risk tends to be lower than individual risk. However, for special status species, and in particular, federally listed species, potential effects to individuals may be relevant, especially for immobile early life stage individuals.</p> <p>DEIS 4.6-15. Despite this acknowledgment, the DEIS’s treatment of listed species, including the Colorado pikeminnow, razorback sucker, and southwestern willow flycatcher, fails to undertake any informed analysis of population-level effects or effects on sensitive life stages.</p>	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
307.116	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>e. The EIS Must Address Reactive Gaseous Mercury Deposition</p> <p>OSM must take a proper hard look at FCPP/Navajo Mine Complex’s impact on endangered Colorado pikeminnow, the razorback sucker and their critical habitat. Both fish would be exposed to mercury emissions through surface and groundwater contamination and ambient air exposure, deposition, and runoff into aquatic habitats, and subsequent bioaccumulation through the food chain. Upon entering the San Juan River ecosystem, microorganisms convert mercury to methylmercury, a highly toxic form of mercury. Because methylmercury is stable and accumulates through the food chain, the highest mercury concentrations are found in top predators, such as the Colorado pikeminnow, causing reproductive impairment, behavioral changes and brain damage. The FWS and OSM must evaluate the relative contribution of reactive gaseous mercury deposition from FCPP and other coal-fired power plants in the action area. The Desert Rock BiOp notes that “[t]he reactive form of mercury is often deposited to land or water surfaces much closer to their sources due to its chemical reactivity and high water solubility” and that “[p]articulate mercury is transported and deposited at intermediate distances depending on aerosol diameter or mass” (Id. at 74.).</p> <p>Data from Mesa Verde National Park show mercury concentrations in precipitation that are “among the highest measured in the United States” and “have trajectories that trace back to within 50 km of the FCPP and SJGS,” supporting the theory that “air masses passing from south Arizona and near these coal-fired power plant facilities [FCPP and SJGS] are contributing to high deposition of mercury there” (Id. at 75; see also MSI Report ). There is also a “clear increase” in mercury deposition in lake bottoms in southwestern Colorado that correlates with the construction of FCPP and SJGS between 1963 and 1977 (Id.). These two plants “are among the largest sources of mercury emissions in the western U.S.” (Id. At 76). The BiOp suggests but does not explicitly link the reactive form of mercury presumably coming from FCPP and SJGS and the fact that pikeminnow are experiencing reproductive impairment due to mercury.</p>	<p>The EPRI WARMF model, which was the basis of the San Juan River ERA includes a detailed fate and transport model that includes the deposition and re-emission of gaseous mercury (gaseous elemental and reactive gaseous mercury) as well as particulate mercury within the San Juan watershed. This study considered the accumulation of various species of mercury from all known sources and modeled the fate of this mercury from its deposition to land and waters within the San Juan watershed, and its movement through the food chain.</p>
307.117	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>f. Analysis of Mercury in Muscle Plugs and Emissions Sources</p> <p>The EIS and Section 7 consultation should undertake an analysis to determine whether and how much of the tissue-bound mercury in endangered Colorado pikeminnow is derived from mercury deposited by FCPP and other regional coal-fired power plants. The DEIS does not answer this question. The ERAs, by focusing solely on the narrow question of whether a hazard quotient is greater or less than 1 (whether a risk exists or not) under various scenarios, also fail to address the relative contribution of FCPP and other four corners plants to mercury accumulation in fish tissues. In order to determine the sources from which mercury in endangered fish muscle tissue samples is derived, OSM, USFWS and USGS must, as part of the EIS and Biological Opinion process, undertake a study to compare isotopic signatures of</p>	<p>Information about the relative contribution of mercury in tissue plugs from Colorado pikeminnow from various sources, including the FCPP is not available. Peer-reviewed site-specific modeling by EPRI shows that the future contributions of mercury from FCPP will be quite small relative to other sources, as previously discussed. NEPA regulations require that agencies insure the professional integrity, including scientific integrity, of the discussions and analyses in an EIS.</p> <p>The commenter requests that mercury isotope studies be used to compare isotopic signatures of mercury in fish to those from the FCPP and other regional and pan-regional mercury sources, to determine the sources from which mercury in endangered fish is derived. Such isotopic studies are currently still in the research and development phase, and substantial</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						mercury in endangered fish tissue samples to isotopic signatures of mercury from FCPP and other regional and pan-regional mercury sources. Short of undertaking of this or another such analyses, neither OSM nor USFWS can ensure that FCPP's past, ongoing and future mercury deposition is not significantly responsible for elevated mercury and corresponding jeopardy in endangered San Juan River fish.	uncertainty still exists with regard to the certainty of the results of such studies.
307.118	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>g. Consideration of Recovery Plans</p> <p>The DEIS, in its abbreviated consideration of impacts to the Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker, fails to give any consideration to the recovery plans for those species adopted pursuant to ESA Section 4(f) (See United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Colorado pikeminnow (<i>ptychocheilus lucis</i>) recovery goals: amendment and supplement to the Colorado squawfish recovery plan (2002) (attached as Exhibit 57); United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Razorback sucker (<i>Xyracuchen texanus</i>) recovery goals: amendment and supplement to the razorback sucker recovery plan (2002) (attached as Exhibit 58). In particular, the DEIS fails to assess whether continued operations at the mine and power plant would undermine or conflict with these recovery plans. Both these plans include the San Juan River as an integral part of the downlisting or delisting strategy for the species. For the pikeminnow, the San Juan is one of only three subbasins supporting the species, and downlisting requires a population of at least 1000 age 5+ fish (See Desert Rock BiOp at 121). "In the Recovery Goals for the Razorback Sucker (Service 2002b), the San Juan River system is one of two that must show stable or increasing trends in order to achieve downlisting or delisting" (Id.).</p> <p>In the Desert Rock BiOp, however, the Service concluded that these delisting goals could not be met due to the toxic and reproductive impacts of mercury on the pikeminnow and selenium on the razorback sucker. Desert Rock BiOp at 121. Neither the DEIS nor the ERAs give any consideration whatsoever to these recovery goals or how FCPP contributions to mercury and selenium loads will affect the possibility of achieving those goals.</p>	<p>The impacts of the proposed action on listed species would be negligible as discussed throughout the Final EIS, and thus would not affect the recovery of these species. This will be evaluated in detail in the ESA Section 7 consultation. The following text was added to the fisheries effects analysis in the FCPP section of Section 4.8.4.1.</p> <p>The effects of the Proposed Action, including the BMPs, conservation measures, and RPAs would not affect the potential for recovery of the Colorado pikeminnow or razorback sucker. The recovery plan for these species identify the recovery of populations in the San Juan Basin as essential (USFWS 2002a, b). The Proposed Action is a continuation of activities that were currently in effect when the recovery plans were written, with the same effects with regard to entrainment, passage impairment, and potential for release of non-native fish from Morgan Lake, and greatly reduced emissions of mercury and selenium. While mercury and selenium would continue to be released, it would be released in very low amounts that would not perceptibly increase the risk these species face under baseline conditions. The overall effect on the recovery of the species would be negligible. This effect would be offset by applicant proposed conservation measures including development of the Colorado pikeminnow PVA, which provides a tool to better assess the potential effects of management actions in the future, and the proponent's ongoing participation in the SJRRIP, whose focus is recovering these two species.</p>
307.119	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>h. Impacts of Climate Change</p> <p>OSM and FWS must consider the impacts that climate change will have on candidate and listed species and their critical habitat, in particular relative to existing non-climate impact vectors, like mercury deposition.</p>	<p>Climate change will occur and affect organisms and their habitat over the life of the Proposed Action and beyond, whether or not the Proposed Action occurs. Climate change has the potential to change precipitation patterns, including the timing, intensity, and type of precipitation received; runoff patterns based on the amount of precipitation falling as snow and when snowmelt occurs; and atmospheric temperatures, which exhibit a strong influence on water temperatures. Climate change models generally agree that the southwest will get drier in the next century, with runoff decreasing 8 to 25 percent (Seager et al. 2007), resulting in decreased water availability to meet all demands, including those of fish.</p> <p>This reduction in precipitation will make it increasingly challenging to meet the flow recommendations for the San Juan River, established to protect listed fish and other native fish species, especially the high-flow</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							<p>requirements that provide for channel maintenance and create habitat for listed fish and which have a strong influence on the riparian habitats upon which southwestern willow flycatcher and yellow-billed cuckoo rely.</p> <p>Native fish in the San Juan River cannot move upstream in response to climate changes because their migration is blocked by Navajo Dam (USFWS 2002a,b), which precludes migration to more favorable upstream areas as a behavioral adaptation to changing climate conditions. However, Navajo Dam currently releases water that is colder than what would naturally be present during the summer and fall months (USFWS 2006). Thus, the temperature effect of climate change could be offset by the dam's operation.</p> <p>Change precipitation patterns an atmospheric warming would likely affect the distribution of suitable habitat for Mexican spotted owl, as terrestrial landscapes adapt to these changes. Fire frequency and severity may increase as a result of these changes, which may further affect the distribution of the habitats that Mexican spotted owl depend upon. Mexican spotted owl will likely change their distribution in response, selecting alternate nesting and migratory stopover habitats.</p> <p>The listed plant species would also be affected by climate change and associated changes in precipitation and atmospheric temperatures. Populations of Mesa Verde cactus and Mancos milk-vetch have been observed to decrease during periods of drought. Because these species are endemic to a restricted set of geological formations and have limited dispersal ability, climate change may threaten the long term persistence of these species. Fickeisen plains cactus and Zuni fleabane are also highly specialized with a narrow endemic range that may be similarly affected by climate change.</p> <p>The Final EIS has been amended to be consistent with the findings of the Section 7 consultation, including the effects of climate change. The additional text does not change the conclusions from the Draft EIS.</p>
307.120	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>The direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to threatened and endangered species and their critical habitats must be analyzed as a result of the proposed FCPP/Navajo Mine/Transmission Corridor project area, per compliance requirements with Section 7 of the ESA, 16 U.S.C. § 1536, and its implementing regulations, at 50 C.F.R. § 402. Those impacts include but are not limited to the impacts of mercury and selenium pollution resulting from coal mining, combustion, waste disposal and climate change on all the listed species and critical habitat in question. In addition, the Navajo Nation Fish and Wildlife Department and Hopi Tribe must be consulted on any potential action concerning the Navajo Nation and potential impacts to species listed under the Navajo Endangered Species List ("NESL"), and Hopi Land crossed by transmission corridors, and impacted by FCPP emissions.</p>	<p>ESA compliance is being addressed through a separate Section 7 process with the USFWS. As part of this process, OSMRE has prepared a biological assessment and submitted that document to the USFWS for their review, thus initiating Section 7 consultation. The findings of the USFWS will be provided in their Biological Opinion for the project, which will include any reasonable and prudent measures and reasonable and prudent alternatives the USFWS deems necessary to reduce, eliminate and offset any impacts to listed species and designated critical habitat. The NEPA process has a different environmental baseline than the ESA process, and the EIS addresses the requirements under NEPA. No changes were made to the document specifically to address this comment, but additional information regarding the potential ecological risks associated with baseline, future FCPP, and future contributions of globally transmitted COPECs was added to the EIS.</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
307.121	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>7. OSM Failed To Take A Hard Look At The Project's Impacts To Environmental Justice</p> <p>As noted in our scoping comments and above, there can be no real dispute that the Navajo people have been disproportionately affected by the extensive energy development – including coal, oil and gas, and uranium – that has occurred on the Navajo Nation (See Conservation Groups' Scoping Comments at 62-70). Adverse social, economic, and health effects are associated with the Project. DEIS at 4.11-21-24. Continued operation of the Project would cause additional, and cumulative impacts on Navajo communities surrounding the Project; the Project would continue to emit SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, VOCs, CO, arsenic, lead, mercury, selenium, among other hazardous materials, and would therefore contribute to “ambient air quality deterioration, visibility impairment, and dry and wet deposition in the ROI.” DEIS at 4.11-14-15. Continued operation of the Project would increase ecological risks to terrestrial and aquatic habitats due to “deposition of metal emissions.” DEIS at 4.11-25. In addition, the Project “would result in extensive adverse impacts to landforms and topography during mining.” DEIS at 4.11-15. Continued operation and expansion of the coal ash disposal areas “would have the potential to contaminate local groundwater and water quality in Chaco Wash.” DEIS at 4.11-18. Stock ponds used to sustain livestock in the area would also be adversely affected. DEIS at 4.11-18. More glaringly, residents in the area would be relocated, and access to grazing areas on Navajo land would be restricted.” DEIS at 4.11-19. Accidental release of the ash disposal impoundments could occur, and off-site contamination from historical coal combustion waste “could occur as a result of seepage in groundwater.” DES at 4.11-23. Due to air quality deterioration, the Project will continue to affect public health. DEIS at 4.11-24. “Impacts would primarily affect Navajo populations.” DEIS at 4.11-15; see also 4.11-15-24.</p> <p>Despite these impacts, OSM glosses over the disproportionate impact that the Project has had and will continue to have if it continues to operate.</p>	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis. The Environmental Justice analysis included in the Draft EIS discusses each resource category addressed in the Draft EIS, and also considers multi-media and cross-media effects. Many of the potential effects referenced in your comment would be either minor, or abated by applicant proposed measures to result in minor effects. OSMRE prepared the Environmental Justice analysis in accordance with CEQ guidance and Executive Order 12898, and in doing so took a hard look at potential effects.
307.122	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		<p>For example, although the DEIS mentions that “San Juan County has a higher incidence of chronic lower respiratory disease comprised of chronic bronchitis, asthma, and emphysema compared to New Mexico or the rest of the United States,” DEIS at 4.11-13, it does not address this situation in any detail. OSM notes that impacts to air quality “would be greatly reduced” under the No Action alternative compared to the Proposed Action, OSM nevertheless fails to consider the Project's contribution to air quality impacts, in particular on the Navajo Nation, in any real detail. Instead, it summarily concludes that impacts would be minor, even while conceding that “elevated levels of ozone in San Juan County were linked to incidence of asthma-related medical visits (NMDH 2007). DEIS at 4.11-13.</p>	Please see response to comment 307.043.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
307.123	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		The DEIS notes that “[m]ercury and other contaminants may be deposited in the soil due to power plant operations, and humans may ingest these contaminants through consumption of farm products grown in these soils, or fish harvested from local waters.” DEIS at 4.11-13. Despite the Project’s contribution to the problem, and the documented toxicity even in small amounts, OSM again glosses over the problem, summarily concluding - without any citation to support its conclusion - that according to risk assessments, it should not be a problem. DEIS at 4.11-13.	The Draft EIS contains both human health and ecological risk assessments, conducted according to EPA and other appropriate regulatory guidance. These assessments were reviewed by OSMRE, experts in the field, and with technical support from the cooperating agencies. These sources are cited in the Draft EIS, and provide a thorough analysis of this issue.
307.124	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	Given OSM’s responsibility to address environmental justice concerns, it is unclear why OSM did not include additional information about the impacts to the Navajo. This failure is especially apparent given Conservation Groups’ repeated request for a public health study.	The Environmental Justice analysis contains a comprehensive discussion of potential effects to the Navajo Nation, which is recognized as an Environmental Justice population (i.e. minority population) in Section 4.11. Potential environmental justice effects to human health are founded on the findings of Section 4.1, Air Quality, Section 4.17, Health and Safety, and references cited therein.
307.125	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	8. OSM Failed To Take A Hard Look At The Project’s Impacts to Trust Assets  Historically, Navajo Mine is Federal land held in trust for Navajo Nation. Department of the Interior oversees the lease and FCPP is a Federal facility. Secretarial responsibilities need to account for leasing, bonding, liabilities and the entire financial implications of mine ownership within the context of the coal complex. The FCPP Lease site is definitely Federal land held in trust for Navajo Nation with connectivity to Navajo Mine. Trust assets sections in DEIS are deficient (example, potential breach at CCW impoundments would result in “minor” impact to Navajo Nation according to DEIS).	The Secretary of the Interior has not yet signed Amendment #3, which authorizes continued operation of FCPP. The Secretary’s decision is based on the findings and completion of the NEPA process. The Secretary’s trust responsibilities on this project do include ensuring that the Navajo Nation are being fairly compensated for the use of trust resources (i.e. coal), as well as that the project does not create an extraordinary liability for the US Federal Government. Section 4.12, Indian Trust Assets. contains detailed analysis of how each alternative would potentially affect all trust assets involved in the project. This Draft EIS Section also provides the regulatory framework applied to measure potential effects (i.e. American Indian Trust Fund Management Reform Action; PL 103-412) and the role of the US Federal Government as the trustee.
307.126	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		The DEIS suggest that there is some credence given to protecting the United States from liability, “DOI/BIA reviews each proposed trust-related project with the intent to approve only those projects found beneficial to the Tribe and do not create a liability for the US (see Section 4.12.2) DEIS at 4.18-50.	Please see Section 4.12.1 for a discussion of US Federal Trust policy, the Secretary’s role in authorizing projects that include trust assets, and BIA’s role to ensure that projects include appropriate management, development, and protection of trust assets.
307.127	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		Yet, current conditions associated with coal could result in less than profitable outcomes for the Navajo Nation. Although it is being pitched that Navajo Nation’s purchase of Navajo Mine will be profitable, there is a chance that liabilities could quickly be imposed on Navajo Nation wiping out their economy.	The Navajo Nation made a business decision to create NTEC which acquired Navajo Mine and will function as the management/owner of that operation. That decision very likely included a consideration of the potential liabilities the Navajo Mine could impose. It is beyond the scope of NEPA to assess business decisions negotiated by a Tribe and another entity. However, the Draft EIS does clearly state in Section 4.10 that the Nation will experience greater than historical revenue streams due to the removal of certain taxes that BHP was responsible for paying.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
307.128	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		<p>This is why requests to see due diligence reports and requests to Sally Jewell are important. These requests have been ignored and the DEIS fails to adequately assess the Trust Assets component of the analysis. The DEIS continues the pattern of minimizing responsibilities when it claims:</p> <p>In January 2014, BIA received a request for Secretarial approval on a mortgage between BHP and NMCC for the Navajo Mine lease area. BIA is reviewing this business transaction for compliance with federal trust policies. The action will undergo NEPA review per the requirements provided in the BIA NEPA Guidebook as Categorical Exclusion for the approval of a mineral lease adjustment or transfer (516 DM 1.5 G[3]). DEIS at 2-34.</p> <p>A Categorical Exclusion by BIA is unacceptable and the DEIS is inaccurate as we can only assume that the transfer here is between BHP and NTEC, as BHP and NMCC are basically the same company.</p>	The request for Secretarial approval on the mortgage between BHP and NMCC is considered a separate action. The Draft EIS has been clarified as follows: The action will undergo NEPA review, as appropriate, per requirements provided in the BIA NEPA Handbook.
307.129	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		<p>We also remind OSM that BHP/NMCC intend to depart by 2016 so any mortgage analysis is a significant fiduciary transition for Navajo Nation taking over ownership of Navajo Mine. BIA is a Cooperating Agency to the DEIS and has to clarify the Trust Responsibility obligations that are obfuscated throughout the DEIS. BIA in no way resolves the bigger Trust Assets issues which should be in the DEIS concerning the Federal government involvement for the facilities/complex and the multitude of financial oversight issues, which are summarily dismissed through the DEIS.</p>	The Navajo Nation made a business decision to create NTEC which acquired the Navajo Mine and entered into a mortgage with BHP to finance that acquisition. It is beyond the scope of NEPA to assess potential effects from a business decision negotiated by a Tribe and another entity. However, BIA will consider potential effects to ITAs as part of the Agency's review of the action's compliance with federal trust policies. Please see Section 4.12.1 for a discussion of US Federal Trust policy, the Secretary's role in authorizing projects that include trust assets, and BIA's role to ensure that projects include appropriate management, development, and protection of trust assets.
307.130	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>9. OSM Failed To Take A Hard Look At The Project's Impacts to Cultural Resources</p> <p>The DEIS sections on cultural resources are deficient. Appendix B. 1 of the DEIS Volume 2 – Appendices includes a list of cultural resources in the APE (“Area of Proposed Effect”) that have no compliance with Section 106 of National Historic Preservation Act (“NHPA”), with incomplete surveys, incomplete and deferred consultations and conclusions, and pending Programmatic Agreements (“PA”).</p> <p>The DEIS takes the unlawful position that:</p> <p>The Proposed Action, including the continuing operations of Navajo Mine, FCPP and the transmission lines, would not result in major adverse effects to cultural resources, Therefore, no additional mitigation is recommended.</p> <p>DEIS at 4.4-35. OSM makes this determination while readily admitting that PAs are being developed, DEIS at 4.4-35, many sites are awaiting pending state and tribal Historic Preservation Officer concurrence with OSM findings, see Appendix B.1 of DEIS, and some properties have simply not been surveyed yet, see Attachment G-1 of the DEIS Volume 2-Appendices, where reports are forthcoming (See Diné Citizens Against</p>	On pages 4.4-20 through 4.4-24, the Draft EIS states repeatedly that OSMRE is consulting with the appropriate agencies under Section 106 and that the Pas for the project will provide procedures to minimize damage to historic properties that are evaluated. This is also summarized in the Executive Summary Table summarizing potential project effects (Table ES-11).

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p>Ruining Our Environment, History of Area IV Site Disturbance presentation (Sept. 2013) (attached as Exhibit 72). In addition, Class I surveys noted in the DEIS are not adequate to evaluate the extents of archaeological resources in the project areas (including transmission lines).</p> <p>This is a classic example of an agency predetermination. Without knowing what the impacts are, or indeed even where all of the relevant sites, OSM simply cannot make the claim that there will be no adverse effects. Moreover, OSM cannot rely on mitigation measures to minimize impacts that have not even been established in the DEIS.</p>	
307.131	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>The DEIS also relies on data recovery as an acceptable treatment for cultural resources instead of avoidance. Preservation in place should always be the first option for treatment and should be so stated. The DEIS does not have a map showing the distribution of significant cultural resources sites in the APE. Without this map, the reader is unable to evaluate whether the proponent has considered the feasibility of avoidance. Some sites may be significant primarily for their landscape relationships or “setting”(for instance rock art and tower observatory/kivas).</p>	<p>Maps of cultural resources are confidential and kept in as part of a separate confidential appendix for cultural resources in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act.</p>
307.132	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		<p>The linkage of cultural resources, visual resources and recreation sources is not made in the DEIS; this failure negates the interdisciplinary analysis, which is fundamental to NEPA, and the requirement to consult under Section 106 of NHPA. The DEIS fails to include landscape assessments which are critical to archeological analysis. The types of sites in the “catchment” of the Navajo Mine direct effects should be evaluated for how representative of the region they are. If we have no terrace Pueblo II unit pueblos left because that landform has been completely mined, then the sites of that type that are left have a higher priority for preservation in place and should not be subject to data recovery.</p> <p>OSM cannot issue a proper DEIS until it has taken a hard look and included relevant information so that decision-makers and the public can review the impacts of the Proposed Action. OSM has failed to perform this hard look and thus the DEIS is incomplete and must be reissued.</p>	<p>As stated on page 4.16-9, modifications to the project area site topography as a result of the mining operations could result in changes to the visual character of the region and potential changes in the recreational setting and experience within viewing distance of the project. Further page 4.15-11 discusses the potential impacts to recreation that could occur as a result of changes in emissions from the FCPP and thereby visual resources in the area.</p>
307.133	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		<p>OSM’s treatment of cumulative impacts in the DEIS is abysmal. As OSM knows well, the Project is not proposed in a vacuum. The Navajo Mine and FCPP sit within an area rife with energy development. Just across the San Juan River sit the San Juan Mine and 1800-MW San Juan Generating Station. Less than 200 miles to the West, the Navajo Generating Station emits additional pollution. Lee Ranch and El Segundo coal mines are about 125 miles to the South. Oil and gas development – thousands of oil and gas wells, associated compressor stations, processing facilities, and other infrastructure, as assessed by the Bureau of Land Management’s Farmington Field Office through a Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement – are,</p>	<p>In the Draft EIS, OSMRE properly considers the cumulative impacts of the Proposed Action and alternatives “when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions.” 40 C.F.R. §1508.7. The Draft EIS uses reasonable temporal and spatial criteria to select the actions for inclusion in the cumulative effects analysis, screening them against the criteria to be included in that analysis. See Draft EIS at Table 4.18-1. An action meets the spatial criteria if it could have an environmental effect in the same region of influence as the Proposed Action for each resource category. Id. at 4.18-2. An action meets the temporal criteria for inclusion in the Draft EIS’s cumulative impacts analysis if it has already occurred, is ongoing, or is reasonably foreseeable within the Proposed</p>

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						interspersed almost everywhere in this region (See U.S. Dep't of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Farmington Field Office GIS Dep't, Federal Oil and Gas Wells San Juan Basin (Sept. 2008) (attached as Exhibit 59). Please note that this map is now 8 years old, with a great deal of development occurring since this time. BLM notes that "New Mexico has one of the largest oil and gas programs in the Bureau." See <a href="http://www.blm.gov/nm/st/en/prog/energy/oil_and_gas.html">http://www.blm.gov/nm/st/en/prog/energy/oil_and_gas.html</a> ). In addition, BLM is considering, through another Resource Management Plan amendment, increasing the level of oil and gas development through authorization of leasing and drilling in the Mancos Shale formation (79 Fed. Reg. 10548 (Feb 25, 2014). The Desert Rock Energy Project and Gallup to Farmington Freight Rail Line are also under consideration, and would add significant, additional impacts to the region. Indeed, OSM spends 28 pages for a table listing "Projects Considered in the Cumulative Impacts Analysis." DEIS at 4.18-3 – 4.18-31. The cumulative impacts analysis itself, however, is less than 20 pages. Although the length of analysis does not always reveal its quality, here, unfortunately, it does.	Action's timeframe, extending until 2041 plus the reclamation period for the Pinabete permit. Id. The Draft EIS explains the rationale for excluding approximately a dozen projects from the cumulative effects analysis because they do not meet the parameters of a "cumulative impact" under NEPA. See id. at Table 4.18-1. The Draft EIS reasonably concludes that certain projects are not reasonably foreseeable because an evaluation of those projects would be entirely speculative, and, therefore, would not constitute cumulative impacts, as defined for NEPA purposes. See, e.g., id. at 4.18-5, 4.18-7. "[C]umulative impacts that are too speculative or hypothetical to meaningfully contribute to NEPA's goals of public disclosure and informed decision-making need not be considered." See Wyoming v. U.S. Dep't of Agriculture, 661 F.3d 1209, 1253 (10th Cir. 2011). For instance, OSMRE determined that several proposed projects and suspended projects are not reasonably foreseeable because project details are not yet sufficiently defined. See, e.g., Draft EIS at 4.18-5, 4.18-30. Therefore, the potential impacts are too speculative to meaningfully contribute to NEPA's goals of public disclosure and informed decision-making, and need not be considered, consistent with Tenth Circuit precedent. See Wyoming v. U.S. Department of Agriculture, 661 F.3d at 1253.
307.134	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	Conservation Groups brought many of the cumulative impacts of the Project to OSM's attention in our scoping comments, in particular the combined effects on climate change, air quality, public health, and impacts to endangered species caused by the myriad projects and activities within the region. Although OSM touts the importance of scoping in its cumulative impacts section, DEIS at 4.18-1, we do not see the suggestions we made incorporated into the DEIS. We therefore refer you to those comments for a discussion of the cumulative impacts to communities and the environment in the region. In this section of our comments, we focus specifically on the errors in OSM's analysis of cumulative impacts in the DEIS.	Section 1.5 reviews the Scoping process and the role of comments in the EIS process. OSMRE carefully reviewed all comments to inform the breadth of issues and alternatives to be included in the Draft EIS. As with all comments received, OSMRE reviewed the Conservation Group's scoping comments on cumulative effects and considered them in the formulation of that analysis.
307.135	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	As discussed in more detail above, OSM's consideration of cumulative impacts is flawed from the start in that it attempts to sweep all past impacts into what it calls the baseline. See, e.g., DEIS at 4.18-1.	Please see Master Response #14, Baseline. With specific regard to air quality and GHG, Sections 4.18.3.1 and 4.18.3.2 include an annual breakdown of historic emissions from all power plants in the region beginning in 2000.
307.136	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		Although that approach would not necessarily be problematic if OSM then added the present and future impacts to that baseline, and then considered the impacts as a whole, OSM does not do that. Instead, anything that OSM includes part of this baseline, OSM either ignores or discounts so that OSM effectively considers only the impacts of the Project itself, thus completely eliminating any legitimate discussion of cumulative impacts.	As discussed in Section 4.18, the cumulative effects analysis considers past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. This approach offers a structured and consistent method for all NEPA documents to assess cumulative effects. Also, as provided in Master Response #14 Baseline, past and present effects of the Navajo Mine and FCPP are generally captured as part of the existing environment and baseline.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
307.137	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		OSM even goes so far as to claim that “[i]n general, the environmental analysis under NEPA is forward- looking, in that it focuses on the potential impacts of the proposed action that an agency is considering.” DEIS at 4.18-1. This confined view – effectively, a vacuum from reality – of the NEPA process forgets the requirement for cumulative impacts, which requires “a full and fair consideration” of the “incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions.” 40 C.F.R. §§ 1502.1, 1508.7, 1508.8, 1508.9.	As provided in Section 4.18, the technical approach for assessing cumulative effects is derived from CEQ and EPA guidance. The Draft EIS cumulative effects analysis considers potential project effects in relation to 83 past, present, and future actions. This list of projects was developed in coordination with all cooperating agencies to this NEPA process. The incremental effect to the cumulative environment from project related actions is discussed for each resource area, and was given equal consideration when measuring effects.
307.138	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		Moreover, it fails to recognize that CEQ’s NEPA regulations clearly warn that the mere fact that a project may provide some benefits does not mean that impacts are insignificant and does not justify an agency taking a blind eye at adverse impacts. 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27(b)(1).	CEQ’s definition of an “effect” (40 CFR 1508.8) states that “[e]ffects may also include those resulting from actions which may have both beneficial and detrimental effects, even if on balance the agency believes that the effect will be beneficial.” Furthermore, CEQ’s definition of “significantly” (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(1)) states that “[i]mpacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant effect may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the effect will be beneficial.” This definition is provided by CEQ to recognize that a project can have both positive and negative effects, and not simply adverse, but also significant beneficial impacts. OSMRE abided by this guidance in framing potentially significant effects and discusses the both project’s beneficial and adverse effects.
307.139	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		OSM also fatally errs in segmenting cumulative impacts into resource area, and thus failing to consider the cumulative impact of the myriad impacts on, for example, public health or the environment. DEIS at 4.18-1 (“The integration of the effects must be within each resource category.”). CEQ Guidance on Cumulative Impacts specifically notes as a guiding principle that an agency must “[a]ddress additive, countervailing, and synergistic effects.” CEQ 1997 at 37.	Impacts within the cumulative effects analysis are evaluated by resource area in order to facilitate a more organized section; however, within each resource area as applicable, discussions of related effects are provided. For instance, Section 4.18.3.5, Water Resources discusses the impacts to surface water quality from emissions and deposition within the region, similarly 4.18.3.8, Special Status Species discusses the effects of water quality changes due to deposition of air emissions on aquatic and riparian habitats, Section 4.18.3.9, Land Use, discusses the changes in land use and the potential effects due to increased noise, traffic, dust, and light pollution, Section 4.18.3.17 Public Health and Safety discusses the Human Health Risk Assessment which analyzes effects to human health due to dispersion and deposition of air impacts, as well as ingestion of fish affected by deposition, and ingestion of soil affected by deposition. OSMRE closely abided by the CEQ Guidance on Cumulative Impacts, and performed integrated analysis, as referenced above, on those resource areas with related effects.  The cumulative impacts of health and safety addresses impacts within the dispersion area of air emissions from the FCPP because that is the area by which impacts from the Project may overlap with other projects considered in the analysis.  With regard to thresholds of significance, within each resource area section a description (either qualitative or quantitative) is provided which OSMRE used to identify major impacts. These same criteria are used in the analysis of cumulative impacts.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
307.140	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		OSM's cumulative impact section fails most fundamentally, however, in its overall lack of analysis. Put simply, it does not constitute a hard look at cumulative impacts. CEQ notes some of the basic steps in a proper cumulative impacts analysis, including identify[ing] the important cause-and-effect relationships between human activities and resources, ecosystems, and human communities," and then "determin[ing] the magnitude and significance of cumulative effects." CEQ 1997 at 37 (emphasis added). Here, although OSM provides some limited information about the magnitude of effects, the analysis is almost entirely lacking as to the significance of those effects—i.e., an assessment of their true scope, magnitude, and duration.	OSMRE consistently describes and defines intensity and duration of effects in the Cumulative Effects analysis (i.e. negligible, minor, moderate, significant, short-term, long-term). The Cumulative Effects analysis draws on analysis and setting discussions from the individual resource categories. The text of Section 4.18 of the Draft EIS has been modified in order to more explicitly include the analyses presented in the specific resource sections. OSMRE closely abided by CEQ guidance for describing effects (40 CFR 1508.8) and significance (40 CFR 1508.27).
307.141	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	For example, with regard to climate change, OSM merely notes that GHG emissions are cumulative, and quantifies GHGs to be emitted. OSM fails to address the significance of those effects by assessing the incremental impacts of those GHGs relative to other fossil fuel activities – such as coal operations at SJGS and NGS, and oil and gas development in the San Juan Basin – and relative to the anticipated consequences of climate change to the region, period. To do so, OSM would need to determine what level of GHG emissions would be significant, instead of dismissing any level as “relatively small,” and at least acknowledge that even incremental emissions, when understood in the proper context and relative to the intensity of climate change, may be significant – information critical to assess the propriety of allowing coal operations to continue beyond 2016. DEIS at 4.18-36. Moreover, this failure to take a hard look at impacts, versus just quantifying emissions then dismissing such emissions as “relatively small,” underscores OSM absolute failure to “modify, or add alternative to avoid, minimize, or mitigate significant cumulative effects.” CEQ 1997 at 37; 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14. Moreover, even if it is reasonable to conclude that impacts are “relatively small,” there are clearly “unresolved conflicts” concerning the mine and power plant complex compelling the consideration of alternatives that would eliminate or reduce GHG emissions. 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(E). As discussed below, OSM fails to include any alternatives, other than the required No Action alternative, that would reduce cumulative impacts to climate change.	Impacts from changes in FCPP GHG emissions and cumulative impacts from regional, national, and global GHG emissions are addressed in Master Response #5. With regard to alternatives, please see Master Responses #2 and #3.
307.142	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		OSM's analysis of cumulative impacts to public health is even more troublesome. Instead of considering the contribution of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable impacts to public health, OSM appears to consider only future effects of the Project, and within those impacts, only the impacts from deposition of toxics, and air pollution. DEIS at 4.18-53-54. Thus, OSM completely fails to consider impacts to public health due to water pollution, changes in climate, and other stressors. Instead, as CEQ recommends, OSM should establish a threshold of significance, and consider whether past impacts have already brought impacts close to that threshold:	As discussed in Master Response #14, Baseline, past and present effects of the Navajo Mine and FCPP are generally captured as part of the existing environment and baseline. Furthermore, the existing cumulative environment took into account the past or ongoing operations of 63 projects. It is worth noting that there is no requirement/recommendation by CEQ, or the OSMRE NEPA Handbook, to assign thresholds of significance for assessing cumulative effects; therefore the Draft EIS did not. In regards to cumulative public health and safety issues, Draft EIS Section 4.17 (Health and Safety) includes a detailed analysis of the potential effects to human health from FCPP emissions, as well as discussion on the technical approach and human health risk models

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						Ideally, the analyst can identify a threshold beyond which change in the resource condition is detrimental. More often, the analyst must review the history of that resource and evaluate whether past degradation may place it near such a threshold. For example, the loss of 50% of historical wetlands within a watershed may indicate that further losses would significantly affect the capacity of the watershed to withstand floods. It is often the case that when a large proportion of a resource is lost, the system nears collapse as the surviving portion is pressed into service to perform more functions. CEQ 1997 at 41. OSM's cumulative impacts analysis must include this sort of analysis for it to be meaningful. This, in turn, should be used to inform OSM's identification, consideration, and comparative evaluation of alternatives and mitigation measures. "unresolved conflicts" concerning the mine and power plant complex compelling the consideration of alternatives that would eliminate or reduce public health impacts. 42 U.S.C. §§ 4332(2)(C)(iii); 4332(2)(E); 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14. As we noted above, to perform this level of analysis, it is likely that OSM will need to perform a public health study given the significant period and extent of stressors to public health.	developed for the EIS, and references to other public health studies prepared for the area. The cumulative analysis used these project related effects and considered the integral effect when added to reasonably foreseeable future actions.
307.143	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		Furthermore, OSM cannot dismiss impacts as minor merely because "there would be no measureable change to ambient air quality compared to baseline conditions," or because "there would be a reduction in FCPP emissions as a result of compliance with EPA's BART rule." DEIS at 4.18-54. As noted above, a continuation of the status quo – in particular when the status quo involves continuous emissions of various types of pollution to the air, land, and water – does not necessarily equate to a finding of minor impacts.	Ambient air quality meets all federal NAAQS, emissions from FCPP would be reduced and would not contribute to exceedance of NAAQS; therefore, impacts would be minor.
307.144	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	For OSM's proposition to hold water, OSM must make several assumptions that are inherently flawed. First, it must assume that there is no difference between a power plant and mine that operate for fifty years and a power plant and mine that operate for seventy-five years. This argument has already been rejected. In a similar case, BLM claimed because the proposed action would not cause a change to existing operations, and therefore those operations did not need to be considered. South Fork Band, 588 F.3d at 725-26. The court rejected that idea, stating: "the mine expansion will create ten additional years of such transportation that is, ten years of environmental impacts that would not be present in the no-action scenario." Id. at 725. As such, the court held that BLM's attempt to avoid addressing the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts was inconsistent with NEPA's mandates. Id. Here too, even if the Project will not change existing operations, it will allow for continued operation of the mine and power plant, and thus allow for additional pollution – with attendant impacts to public health – for the life of the project.	The Draft EIS is transparent in its disclosure of effects and offers a comparison of effects between alternatives in Table ES-11. The Draft EIS includes three different temporal periods (i.e. historical, baseline/existing, and future) in describing potential effects. The Draft EIS discusses in detail the potential effects resulting from another 25 years of operation and quantifies effects, where feasible, of continued operations.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
307.145	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		Second, to reach its finding that impacts will be minor, OSM must also assume that past impacts do not exist; OSM must look at incremental impacts without considering those impacts “when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions.” 40 C.F.R. § 1508.7. Considering impacts out of context, however, misses the point of a cumulative impacts analysis. “[E]ven a slight increase in adverse conditions that form an existing environmental milieu may sometimes threaten harm that is significant. One more factory . . . may represent the straw that breaks the back of the environmental camel.” Grand Canyon Trust, 290 F.3d at 342 (quoting Hanly v. Kleindienst, 471 F.2d 823, 831 (2d Cir. 1972).	As discussed in Master Response #14, Baseline, past and present effects of the Navajo Mine and FCPP are generally captured as part of the existing environment and baseline. Furthermore, the existing cumulative environment took into account the past or ongoing operations of 63 projects. As provided in Section 4.18, the technical approach for assessing cumulative effects is derived from CEQ and EPA guidance. Potential incremental effects to the cumulative environment from project related actions are discussed for each resource area in Section 4.18.
307.146	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	The cursory analysis of cumulative impacts the EIS did provide is also, on its face, inadequate, providing only a “perfunctory” analysis that does not “provide a useful analysis of the cumulative impacts of past, present, and future projects.” Te-Moak, 608 F.3d at 603-08 (“A cumulative impact analysis must be more than perfunctory; it must provide a useful analysis of the cumulative impacts of past, present, and future projects.” (internal citations omitted)). The cumulative impacts section provided in the DEIS fails to provide a useful analysis of the cumulative impacts, and must be supplemented.	In the Draft EIS, OSMRE properly considers the cumulative impacts of the Proposed Action and alternatives “when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions.” 40 C.F.R. § 1508.7. The Draft EIS uses reasonable temporal and spatial criteria to select the actions for inclusion in the cumulative effects analysis, screening them against the criteria to be included in that analysis. See Draft EIS at Table 4.18-1. An action meets the spatial criteria if it could have an environmental effect in the same region of influence as the Proposed Action for each resource category. Id. at 4.18-2. An action meets the temporal criteria for inclusion in the Draft EIS’s cumulative impacts analysis if it has already occurred, is ongoing, or is reasonably foreseeable within the Proposed Action’s timeframe, extending until 2041 plus the reclamation period for the Pinabete permit. Id. The Draft EIS explains the rationale for excluding approximately a dozen projects from the cumulative effects analysis because they do not meet the parameters of a “cumulative impact” under NEPA. See id. at Table 4.18-1. The Draft EIS reasonably concludes that certain projects are not reasonably foreseeable because an evaluation of those projects would be entirely speculative, and, therefore, would not constitute cumulative impacts, as defined for NEPA purposes. See, e.g., id. at 4.18-5, 4.18-7. “[C]umulative impacts that are too speculative or hypothetical to meaningfully contribute to NEPA’s goals of public disclosure and informed decision-making need not be considered.” See Wyoming v. U.S. Dep’t of Agriculture, 661 F.3d 1209, 1253 (10th Cir. 2011). For instance, OSMRE determined that several proposed projects and suspended projects are not reasonably foreseeable because project details are not yet sufficiently defined. See, e.g., Draft EIS at 4.18-5, 4.18-30. Therefore, the potential impacts are too speculative to meaningfully contribute to NEPA’s goals of public disclosure and informed decision-making, and need not be considered, consistent with Tenth Circuit precedent. See Wyoming v. U.S. Department of Agriculture, 661 F.3d at 1253.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
307.147	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	OSM's treatment of alternatives fails to provide this clarity; the similarity of the alternatives forecloses the possibility that their comparison will define the issues or provide a clear basis for choice.	OSMRE considered a range of alternatives to carry forward for detailed analysis in Section 3.2 that included a reasonable range of alternatives viewed as meeting the selection criteria described in Section 3.1. Section 3.3 discussed other alternatives that were considered during project development and through the scoping process (conversion of FCPP to non-coal fired energy options; solar thermal/ coal hybrid; carbon capture and storage; alternative mining techniques; and off-site coal supply). OSMRE's evaluation of the alternatives discussed in Section 3.3 determined that they did not meet all of the selection criteria, and based on this evaluation, OSMRE did not carry these alternatives forward for detailed analysis in the Draft EIS.
307.148	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		Although the No Action alternative normally would help to ameliorate this flaw, OSM muddles the situation even more by failing to analyze the No Action alternative in the same way as it discusses the action alternatives.	Per 40 CFR Part 1502.14(d) OSMRE carried forward the No Action alternative for detailed analysis in the Draft EIS along with 4 action alternatives. Under the No Action alternative, the following actions were analyzed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSMRE would deny the SMCRA permit for the Pinabete Permit Area</li> <li>• OSMRE would not renew the SMCRA permit for the Navajo Mine Permit Area</li> <li>• BIA would not approve the lease amendment for the FCPP</li> <li>• BIA would not approve the realignment of Burnham Road</li> <li>• BIA and/or BLM would not renew the leases for the four subject transmission line ROWs</li> <li>• All other agency approvals described under the action alternatives would not occur</li> </ul>
307.149	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		These deficiencies are exacerbated by OSM's failure to take a hard look at direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts—in particular relative to the context and intensity of not only the projected 25 years of continued coal mining, coal combustion, and coal ash disposal operations, but relative to the context and intensity of the prior 50 years of coal activity.	Please see Master Response #1. OSMRE closely abided by CEQ and the OSMRE NEPA Handbook in framing direct, indirect, and cumulative effects. With specific reference to taking a hard look at past and ongoing operations, please see Master Comment #6 Baseline.
307.150	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		As an initial matter, OSM failed to ensure that the No Action alternative served its purpose to illustrate the impacts of the Proposed Action as compared to a No Action alternative. As the Ninth Circuit has explained:  The goal of the statute is to ensure "that federal agencies infuse in project planning a thorough consideration of environmental values." The consideration of alternatives requirement furthers that goal by guaranteeing that agency decisionmakers "[have] before [them] and take [ ] into proper account all possible approaches to a particular project (including total abandonment of the project ) which would alter the environmental impact and the cost-benefit balance."	OSMRE analyzed a no action alternative at an equivalent level of detail to the other action alternatives, and there is a comparative analysis of the alternatives, including no action, in the Draft EIS. However, the No Action alternative does not represent the environmental baseline for the impact analysis, as discussed in detail in Section 4.0, Approach to Environmental Analysis. OSMRE compared the effects of the No Action and the Action alternatives to the environmental baseline as defined in Section 4.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
307.151	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	However, throughout the DEIS, OSM fails to use the No Action alternative to analyze impacts in comparative form. Instead, OSM downplays benefits of the No Action alternative and highlights the negative consequences of the No Action alternative that would actually be common to all alternatives. For example, in the discussion of air quality impacts, the DEIS lists emissions under the No Action alternative for years 2014 and 2015 when under any alternative the mine and power plant would continue operations, instead of discussing the benefits of reduced emissions in future years, other than a limited discussion of ozone. DEIS at 4.1-104. OSM's analysis of the No Action alternative for climate change is similar. DEIS at 4.2-23-24.	OSMRE analyzed a no action alternative at an equivalent level of detail to the other action alternatives, and there is a comparative analysis of the alternatives, including no action, in the Draft EIS. The Air Quality consequences of the No Action Alternative has been revised as follows:  "Under the No Action alternative, criteria emissions would continue through 2015 until the FCPP shuts down; after this time, stack emissions would cease."  This meaning was implied by the statement, but the modification makes this more clear. Furthermore, in section 4.2.4.5 the Draft EIS clearly states that GHG emissions would cease after 2016.
307.152	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		Even more egregiously, OSM highlights impacts to paleontological resources that would occur with the No Action alternative, but again, these impacts would occur with any alternative and thus should be discussed accordingly. DEIS at 4.3-27.	The text has been revised for each action alternative to include localities 30 and 42.
307.153	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		Similarly, OSM fails to consider or analyze the benefits of the No Action alternative and shutdown of FCPP with regard to deposition of heavy metals: "since the FCPP is only one of a number of power plants in the area, potential metal uptake by plants would not be eliminated and it is unknown if any beneficial impacts to vegetation would occur as a result of FCPP shutdown." DEIS at 4.6-21. This argument is odd given the weight OSM places, elsewhere, on the reduced magnitude of impacts of post-2016 operations given the retirement of units 1-3.	Section 4.6.4.5 states that "FCPP shutdown would eliminate deposition of air emissions from the power plant, which would reduce potentially adverse indirect effects of mercury and selenium and other metal uptake by plants in the ROI over the long term." This is the sentence directly before the one referenced in the comment and clearly acknowledges the beneficial effect of reducing the deposition mercury and selenium in the region. The uncertainty in this conclusion stems from the technical difficulty in allocating a proportion of responsibility to specific emission sources.
307.154	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		In short, OSM seems to want to downplay the benefits of the No Action alternative as much as it wants to downplay the costs of the Proposed Action. This type of analysis is directly contrary to NEPA's goal that alternatives – including the no action alternative – sharply define the issues and present a comparison of costs and benefits of choices. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14.	40 CFR 1502.14 states that an EIS "should present the environmental impacts of the proposal and the alternatives in a comparative form, thus sharply defining the issues and providing a clear basis for choice among options by the decision-makers and public." Table ES-11 provides a comparison of effects for each alternative; thus, providing a clear comparison of the issues and effects. Furthermore, each alternative underwent an equal level of analysis, where technical frameworks were uniformly applied to the alternatives.
307.155	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	OSM also fails to consider reasonable alternatives. The Conservation Groups' scoping comments included several alternatives for consideration in the DEIS:  (1) An alternative that considers retirement of units 1-3 as anticipated, and retirement of units 4-5 by 2027. As a result of this earlier retirement date, this alternative would exclude the Pinabete Expansion, and instead would consider winding down operations at the Navajo Mine. This alternative would need to fully assess liabilities of FCPP/Navajo Mine/Transmission corridors and initiate an economic development scenario that the U.S. Department of the Interior should facilitate, in the role of trust responsibility oversight. This alternative would also require	See Master Comment #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Comment #3, Alternatives with Shorter Lease Terms.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p>analysis of the significant reclamation/restoration required at the project site with financial assurance mechanisms for owners/operators.</p> <p>(2) An alternative that considers the impacts of all potential retirement scenarios the Four Corners, including installation of Selective Catalytic Reduction on units 4 and 5, early retirement of unit 4, and early retirement of units 4 and 5.</p> <p>(3) Proposed Action analysis of the 1,500 MW FCPP/Navajo Mine Expansion/Transmission Corridor renewal 2016-2041, which requires full analysis of liabilities incurred by all owners of facilities and contractual/leasing obligations covering future operations/liabilities and financial assurance mechanisms (for example, for CCW).</p> <p>(4) Transitioning the proposed action facilities to development of economic opportunities for Navajo Nation and region, including potential for manufacturing and incorporating renewable energy opportunities on the FCPP Lease and Navajo Mine sites. This alternative would acknowledge the U.S. Department of the Interior’s obligation to assist the region in identifying that the 50-year historic legacy of the FCPP/Navajo Mine/Transmission Corridors projects will come to end at some point, but, at any rate, within the next 25 years. In preparation for this inevitable transition, the EIS provides the appropriate template to analyze and incorporate diverse agency expertise necessary to develop and evaluate these transition opportunities. This alternative would also account for fair market value of the contractual costs of coal, water, land, royalties, and leasing, which have historically been low, abetting coal development at the expense of resource damages and human public health problems in the region.</p> <p>(5) Analysis of different alternatives for the disposal of coal combustion waste (“CCW”), including alternatives for storage at FCPP, permanent disposal at FCPP, and/or disposal off-site. This analysis must include specifics about how CCW will be handled, and what the storage and/or disposal facilities will look like, with details about pond and/or landfill liners, transportation to facilities, dust suppression techniques and alternatives, water and air monitoring, impacts of the various alternatives, and cumulative impacts of the alternatives. This analysis also must include examination of the legal authority for the various storage and/or disposal options.</p> <p>(6) Alternatives at the Navajo Mine, including an alternative that includes no expansion at the mine, or allowing only the expansion of Area IV North, but not the Pinabete Expansion. This alternative should consider the amounts of coal available to FCPP and whether alternate sources of coal would be needed for various scenarios at FCPP (conservation Groups’ Scoping comments at 23-24).</p> <p>OSM failed to consider these reasonable alternatives, or really any alternatives that deviated from “business as usual.” The only alternative considered for FCPP was a slight reduction of the size of the coal ash disposal area from 385 acres to 350 acres. DEIS at ES-xvii. Other than</p>	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						this insignificant change, no other alternative was considered other than the mandated “no action alternative.” For Navajo Mine, the only alternatives included were slight variations to continued mining. DEIS at ES-xv-xvi. By failing to consider any significant alternative to “business as usual” at the FCPP, the DEIS fails to comply with the purpose of the Act—namely to consider alternatives to the proposed action.	
307.156	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>Moreover, a recent FERC ruling prohibited a contractual sale of Southern California’s transmission rights to Arizona Public Service related to the Four Corners Power Plant (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Order Rejecting Agreement and Tariff, Southern California Edison Company, 146 FERC 61,136, Docket No. ER14-897-000 (Feb. 27, 2014) (attached as Exhibit 70); see also FERC Shoots Down SCE Plan to Transfer Ariz. Transmission Rights to APS, Energy Prospect (March 18, 2014) (attached as Exhibit 71). Instead, FERC ruled that such transmission rights must be subject to open access bidding. The DEIS is deficient for failing to consider the impacts of this FERC decision, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The economic impact the FERC decision on operation of FCPP and the transmission of electricity.</li> <li>• Whether the FERC decision alters OSM’s conclusion that renewable energy alternatives are not economic at the FCPP.</li> </ul>	Please see Master Comment #13 for a discussion on the effects of regulation on the price of electricity. It is difficult to discern the connection between the potential use of the transmission line capacity formerly used by Southern California Edison to deliver FCPP-generated power to its service territory and the screening criteria for the selection of alternatives (i.e. renewable energy generation); therefore, OSMRE does not change its decision that renewable energy generation would not meet the purpose and need of the EIS.
307.157	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	The DEIS should have considered the Conservation Groups’ recommended alternatives, or similar alternatives that considered accelerated retirement schedules, increased use of energy efficiency and renewable energy, storage of CCW off-site and other related alternatives. Not only are these alternatives reasonable and even wiser courses of action, their consideration would be consistent with NEPA’s requirement that alternatives “sharply define” the issues, and provide a “clear basis for choice” for decision-makers and the public. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14.	See Master Comment #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Comment #3, Alternatives with Shorter Lease Terms.
307.158	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		Although the scope of “reasonable alternatives” is delimited by the purpose and need statement articulated by that agency, that statement cannot “define the agency’s objectives in unreasonably narrow terms.” See <i>Ilio’laokalani Coal. v. Rumsfeld</i> , 464 F.3d 1083, 1098, n.5 (9th Cir. 2006). Conservation Groups thus requested that OSM “test the assumption that ‘ongoing operations’ at these facilities best ‘provide for long-term, reliable, continuous and uninterrupted base load electrical power’ relative to a range of renewable energy alternatives and balance that assumption against the agency’s obligation to protect the environment and, in particular, account for climate change” (Conservation Groups’ Scoping Comments at 15-16). Instead, OSM dismisses the alternatives from the DEIS with conclusory and unsupported assertions that they are not feasible. DEIS at 3-48-56.	The Draft EIS considered a wide range of alternatives, that included non-coal and renewable energy alternatives. These alternatives were evaluated from the perspective of technical and economic feasibility, as well ability to meet the purpose and need. An alternative that would not be implemented by the Applicants (due to feasibility or cost) would be functionally the same as the No Action alternative, as the Applicants would shut down operations. Thus alternatives that do not include mining of coal, or renewing the lease of a coal-fired power plant would essentially be the same as the No Action alternative. See also Master Response #2, Renewable Alternatives.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
307.159	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		“The existence of reasonable but unexamined alternatives renders a [NEPA analysis] inadequate.” Friends of Southeast’s Future v. Morrison, 153 F.3d 1059, 1065 (9th Cir. 1998) (citation omitted). The DEIS must be rewritten to include the reasonable alternatives discussed above.	See Master Comment #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Comment #3, Alternatives with Shorter Lease Terms
307.160	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	G. OSM Failed To Guarantee That Relevant Information Is Available To The Public By Failing To Prepare An Adequate DEIS, By Failing To Provide Adequate Opportunity For Public Comment, And By Failing To Allow For Meaningful Public Participation In Public Meetings.  NEPA requires that OSM “make diligent efforts to involve the public in preparing and implementing their NEPA procedures.” 40 C.F.R. § 1506.6(a). Indeed, one of NEPA’s twin goals is “to guarantee relevant information is available to the public.” NPRC, 668 F.3d at 1072. OSM has failed to comply with its duties to inform and involve the public in numerous ways.	Section 1.5.1 provides information on the approach to Scoping that OSMRE employed. Nine scoping meetings were conducted throughout the region and a total of 539 comment letters were received via hard-copy, email, and transcript. Furthermore, OSMRE maintains a project website ( <a href="http://www.wrcc.osmre.gov/initiatives/fourCorners.shtml">http://www.wrcc.osmre.gov/initiatives/fourCorners.shtml</a> ) that is regularly updated with information on the EIS process. In addition, a summary video was produced in English, Navajo, and Hopi to convey the information in the EIS to non-English speakers, or to those wishing an alternate to reading the document. Please also see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format.
307.161	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		First, as discussed in detail above, the DEIS fails to include adequate information about the Project’s impacts to communities and the environment, and consequently has failed to ensure that the public even can be involved in the NEPA process in a meaningful and informed manner.	The Draft EIS gathered and utilized the best available information in characterizing the existing environment and assessing effects. Where site specific and/or recent data was not available, field work was performed to gather qualified data. Furthermore, please see Section 1.5.1 for information on the exhaustive approach to Scoping that OSMRE employed. Nine scoping meetings were conducted throughout the region and a total of 539 comments were received via hard-copy, email, and transcript. Many of the meeting attendees and commenters were local residents of the Navajo Nation and surrounding communities.
307.162	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		Second, OSM has failed to allow for sufficient time to comment on the DEIS. The DEIS itself is over 1500 pages. The references OSM uses to support it are thousands more pages of information. In addition to the length itself, the DEIS addresses numerous aspects of the Project, and a consideration of cumulative impacts in the area encompasses significantly more. Despite the complexity and length of the DEIS, OSM initially provided only a 60-day comment period, and then, after multiple requests (Letter from Conservation Group Request to Marcelo Calle, OSM RE: Request for Extension of Comment Deadline for Four Corners-Navajo Mine Draft Environmental Impact Statement (April 7, 2014) (attached as Exhibit 60), extended that only by 30 days.  To be clear, the Conservation Groups appreciate that OSM is analyzing these connected actions in one EIS; the actions analyzed are part of an interconnected project, and analyzing them separately disallows a cohesive look at the entire project. The consequence of such a large Project, however, is complexity that takes time to address, in particular for the public reviewing the DEIS for the first time and, until now, without OSM ever having provided analysis addressing the mine, power plant, and associated facilities in a single environmental review.  Instead of recognizing the magnitude of the task presented to the public and interested parties, and “mak[ing] diligent efforts to involve the	Please see Master Comment #8, Public Review Period.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p>public,” 40 C.F.R. § 1506.6(a), and ensuring that the public had the time and resources to review the DEIS, OSM constrained ability of the public to participate by making participation a race against the clock. First, OSM allowed only a 60-day comment period. Even if members of the public and staff of the Conservation Groups could have dropped everything else to focus entirely on the DEIS, 60 days would have been an insufficient amount of time to review the DEIS, supporting documents, and draft meaningful comments. Recognizing the obvious fact that no one could focus so intensely, the time provided was entirely inadequate.</p> <p>OSM pointed to the CEQ regulations as justification for the time provided, noting that CEQ regulations only required 45 days for public comment (Letter from Marcelo Calle, OSM, to Megan Anderson, Western Environmental Law Center (April 10, 2014) (attached as Exhibit 61). CEQ regulations, however, are based on the idea that an EIS “shall normally be less than 150 pages and for proposals of unusual scope or complexity shall normally be less than 300 pages.” 40 C.F.R. § 1502.7. Conservation Groups complaint is not that the EIS should have been shorter – indeed, as noted in these comments, Conservation Groups believe that critical information was missing from the DEIS. Rather, Conservation Groups note “normal” page limits to highlight that CEQ regulations anticipate a 45-day comment period for an EIS of 300 pages or less. By that logic, the Project DEIS, which spans over 1500 pages, or 5 times what CEQ regulations project, deserves a comment period 5 times the normal public comment period, or 225 days. Conservation Groups requested only an additional 60 days, for a total of 120 days, but even that was finally limited only to 90 days by OSM.</p> <p>Furthermore, the limited extension finally granted by OSM came, once again, at the last minute. Conservation Groups sent their request for an extension to OSM on April 7, 2014, just 10 days after OSM released the DEIS. Instead of making a timely decision on the request, OSM strung everyone along, noting that it was considering the request and would make a final decision until after the public meetings, or after May 9, 2014 (See, e.g., id.; Letter from Marcelo Calle to Colleen Cooley, Diné C.A.R.E. (April 28, 2014) (attached as Exhibit 62). OSM did not actually grant the limited extension until May 16, 2014 – over a month after Conservation Groups’ request, and only seven business days before the original deadline. 79 Fed. Reg. 28549 (May 16, 2014). OSM made a similar last-minute response to an extension request for the scoping comments, granting a limited extension to that request only six business days before the deadline, and again over a month after Conservation Groups’ request. These delayed responses have been completely inadequate in ensuring that the public can participate fully in the process and suggest gamesmanship by OSM to undermine effective public involvement. Without knowing whether the deadline will be granted, the public must rush to complete comments in the original time provided, rearranging schedules, and pushing other obligations back. Although the extensions are ultimately helpful, their efficacy is limited by OSM’s last-</p>	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						minute decisions. Moreover, OSM has not provided, nor can Conservation Groups think of a reason, why OSM would need to postpone its decision on these reasonable requests. OSM's responsibility as lead agency of the DEIS is to provide for meaningful public involvement, rather than fast-tracking a schedule driven analysis, and leveraging its power as a federal agency to ultimately weaken the ability of the public to participate effectively in this decision-making process – action that only reduces the agency's credibility as an objective agency faithfully implementing and complying with its legal responsibilities, in particular relative to the broad public, rather than the project proponent. 40 C.F.R. § 1506.6.	
307.163	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	Third, the open house format for the nine public meetings (April 30-May 9, 2014) for the DEIS was deficient. OSM opted for resource stations manned primarily with third party consultants with some of the Cooperating Agency personnel available (however, EPA and Navajo EPA were absent from all meetings).	Please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format
307.164	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	The absence of Federal agencies with technical expertise (primarily EPA), and the failure of OSM to include NOAA and USGS as Cooperating Agencies, marginalized the open house meetings. At the Public Meetings, the contractors (Cardno) claimed that they have been constrained by the idea that GHGs are not currently regulated and, as writers of the DEIS to be adopted by OSM and Cooperating agencies, they cannot assert regulatory authority (Personal communication, Mike Eisenfeld SJCA with Dan Tormey, Project Manager for DEIS, Cardno, Public Meeting, Durango, Colorado, May 3, 2014).	Federal agencies that will issue a decision/permit or are providing technical support to OSMRE to develop the EIS are involved as Cooperating Agencies (see Section 1.4.2). NOAA and USGS do not meet these criteria. OSMRE, BIA, USACE, Navajo Nation EPA, had staff members at the scoping meetings. Each alternative, resource area, Agency decision was represented by either a federal agency employee or a contractor assisting DOI in the preparation of the EIS. In regards to GHG regulation, EPA does not currently regulate GHG emissions and therefore, there is no established regulatory framework to apply to this issue. Dr. Tormey told the questioner that the authors of the Draft EIS do not have the authority to develop GHG rulemaking in advance of EPA action on the matter. However, GHG emissions and global climate change is discussed in detail in Section 4.2. EPA issued its Final Rule (August 2012) on the Federal Implementation Plan for BART at FCPP. While EPA is the administering agency for the Clean Air Act, EPA effectively already issued its decision regarding Clean Air Act compliance in the Federal Implementation Plan. Therefore, the Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline since it is already being implemented (i.e. shutdown of Units 1-3) and as the lead agency, OSMRE was well informed and prepared to discuss the Federal Implementation Plan and its role in the Draft EIS.
307.165	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		Mr. Tormey pointed members of Conservation Groups towards EPA to answer our questions on climate change, but EPA unfortunately did not attend any of the Public Meetings on the DEIS. Moreover, OSM cannot consciously or legally allow this DEIS to circumvent climate change impact and/or mitigation. In addition, Navajo EPA was not at any of the nine Public Meetings. As a result, many questions went unanswered.	OSMRE, BIA, USACE, the Navajo Nation EPA, had staff members at the scoping meetings and public review meetings. Each alternative, resource area, Agency decision was represented by either a federal agency employee or a contractor assisting DOI in the preparation of the EIS. In regards to the statement of Dr. Tormey, he referred the questioner to the EPA regarding their jurisdiction over the development of GHG regulation, not regarding questions on the climate change analysis in the Draft EIS. GHG regulation, EPA does not currently regulate GHG emissions and therefore, there is no established regulatory framework to

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							apply to this issue. OSMRE does not avoid discussing GHG emissions or climate change, as Section 4.2 provides a comprehensive discussion of these exact issues.
307.166	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		Similarly, OSM, BIA, and the contractors were unable to adequately respond to questions concerning Indian Trust assets, financial issues, due diligence, and bonding. Cardno erroneously claimed that this analysis covered in the Navajo Mine Transfer EA.	Please see Master Response #8.
307.167	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		The open house format was not conducive for the public to obtain relevant information, as the third party consultants were imprecise, vague, quick to minimize impacts, and quick to point out their limitations in deferral to agency actions and regulations. The format of the public meetings was intimidating to the public. The open house format restricted the value of public hearings where communities can increase knowledge of the issues by listening to diverse vantage points. Although OSM had personnel to record comments in the corner of the meeting rooms, no effort was made by OSM to document individual questions/comments presented to consultants/agency personnel, or answers provided, at any of the public meetings (See, e.g., Video of Public Meeting (available at: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TZcDBZsON94">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TZcDBZsON94</a> (last accessed June 26, 2014).	Please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format.
307.168	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>The open house format was particularly daunting for non-English speaking members of the public. On May 30, 2014, Diné C.A.R.E. filed a formal complaint with OSM. The complaint states the following:</p> <p>On behalf of the Diné people, Diné Citizens Against Ruining Our Environment (Diné C.A.R.E.) is filing a complaint on the process of the Four Corners Power Plant/Navajo Mine Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) public meetings that occurred between April 30-May 9, 2014. We are filing this complaint because it is an environmental justice issue and a serious concern to the Diné people.</p> <p>The EIS public meetings that were hosted by the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation &amp; Enforcement (OSM) was conducted in a poster style format, which was unfamiliar to the Diné public who are used to an open-mic forum seen at Chapter meetings, Council meetings, and other meetings/forums across the Navajo Nation. This EIS process was intimidating and inadequate as there were 20+ OSM staff and third-party consultants, mostly English-speaking individuals standing next to 20+ poster boards. This format was confusing for the Diné people to fully comprehend, especially for the non-English speaking community members. Some experienced harassment, racial profiling, and intimidation by the OSM staff and consultants during these meetings.</p> <p>Attached are several reports by Diné community members portraying their experiences at the EIS public meetings. In addition, Diné C.A.R.E. is awaiting a response from your office on whether OSM can host two</p>	Please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format and Master Response #10, Translation of the EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p>additional hearings on the Navajo Nation before the June 27th comment period deadline for the Draft EIS.</p> <p>We hope the Diné people's concerns are taken with careful and serious Consideration (Letter from Diné C.A.R.E. to Marcelo Calle, Department of the Interior, OSM (May 30, 2014) (attached as Exhibit 63); see also Letter from Diné C.A.R.E to Jared Blumenfeld EPA Region 9 Administrator Re. Office of Surface Mining EIS Public Meetings (May 20,2014) (attached as Exhibit 64).</p>	
307.169	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>OSM's response does not address Diné C.A.R.E.'s or Conservation Groups' concerns. As iterated in Diné C.A.R.E.'s complaint letter, the Diné people are used to an open-microphone forum primarily used in Chapter meetings and community meetings across the Navajo Nation. Thus, OSM's assertion that an open house format is sufficient due to people's fear of public speaking is not an adequate response.</p>	Please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format.
307.170	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>OSM's cursory denial regarding the Diné community members' complaints about the unprofessional manner in which they acted at the EIS public meetings is also disappointing. On behalf of the Diné people, Diné C.A.R.E. filed a formal complaint to OSMRE by organizing and compiling the community members' experiences into one document, which was attached with the complaint letter (See Exhibit 64). Thus, for OSM to say that they "have not received any other complaints of this nature" is misleading because the attachment of eight community members' experiences were provided. OSM's response that they did not receive other complaints of this nature is therefore inaccurate. Further, a Diné community member who attended the Navajo Mine/FCPP EIS hearings alone may not know the process of filing a formal complaint.</p>	<p>OSMRE categorically denies inappropriate behavior of its staff or any participating project personnel. All personnel participating in the scoping and Draft EIS public comment meetings partook in training sessions on cultural sensitivity and public engagement. These training sessions were focused on making all people feel welcome and comfortable, so that attendees would feel free to ask questions and develop informed comments.</p> <p>All OSMRE representatives acted in a professional manner at all times during the public meetings. No accusations were made to anyone at any time. The OSMRE representatives were particularly accommodating to the Diné Care representatives who set up a table at the various public meetings. No change to the Draft EIS.</p>
307.171	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC		<p>The open house format and denial of unprofessionalism continues to illustrate OSM's disregard for the Diné people because it seems Diné people are portrayed as misinformed, unaware of our rights to speak and file a complaint, and fear of public speaking. Ultimately this conduct presents an issue of environmental justice as it seems that OSM is abandoning its duties to ensure "effective community participation in the NEPA process." DEIS at 4.11-1 (citing BIA NEPA Handbook). Moreover, OSM's dismissal of these concerns, and failure to provide adequate opportunities for participation from Diné community members violates the principles of free, prior, and informed consent. See DEIS at 4.11-3 (quoting the EPA National Environmental Justice Advisory Council, Fostering Environmental Justice for Tribes and Indigenous People (Jan. 15, 2013) and United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples).</p>	Please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format and Master Response #10, Translation of the EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
307.172	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	<p>Other community members had similar experiences. San Juan Citizens Alliance’s Executive Director discussed his experience at the Durango public meeting on May 3, 2014, in a column for the Durango Herald:</p> <p>The majority of the dialogue in the room transpired between community members and consultants one-on-one with no record of objections raised or concerns aired. Yes – there was a courtroom recorder hidden in a corner should someone like to lodge formal comments. That poor soul was by far the loneliest person in the room. With all of the venting going on in private dialogues, most of the exchanges went unrecorded – off the record. Effectively, the public was not heard. Well- intentioned though they were – citizens were talking to a wall that pretended to care, emptying their concerns into hollow vessels that would be tossed aside en route to the next “public meeting.”</p> <p>The wonderful thing about government malfeasance these days is how subtle it has become. After years of learning that breaking skulls is a bad long-term strategy for advancing political goals, political disenfranchisement went and got all grown up. If you participated in the “public meeting,” you probably feel that you were heard. And you probably weren’t, not in a way that matters. How sophisticated. So to my much-maligned tea party brethren – I concede that you are absolutely right to be mad. Sometimes, the government really doesn’t care what you or I think.</p> <p>The question, though, becomes: What do we do with our disappointment in obviously, if not purposefully, flawed government processes? And this is where my fleeting dalliance with the tea party begins to sour. The answer, in my humble opinion, is not to eviscerate government. It’s to own it. With rights comes responsibility. Democratic institutions are painfully, lovingly maintained – or lost – based on the public’s acceptance of responsibility for their stewardship. I don’t want the DOI to go away. I want the people who work there to care about public input and best available science (Dan Olson, We can’t allow government to ignore our voices, Durango Herald, Thinking Green, May 15, 2014 (available at: <a href="http://www.durangoherald.com/article/20140514/COLUMNISTS37/140519757/0/FRONTPAGE/We-can't-allow-government-to-ignore-our-voices">http://www.durangoherald.com/article/20140514/COLUMNISTS37/140519757/0/FRONTPAGE/We-can't-allow-government-to-ignore-our-voices</a> (last accessed June 23, 2014).</p> <p>In sum, instead of presenting a forum for community discussion of the Project, the public meetings were marginalized. It appeared that the OSM and the DEIS contractors had convinced themselves that the reduction in emissions as a result of the BART determination and closing of the three older units at FCPP (560 MW) should satisfy the public, thus cutting off additional discussion about other concerns or alternatives. The Conservation Groups request that the DEIS be re-issued and that additional public meetings be held on the amended DEIS that allow for an open and informed public discussion of the Project.</p>	Please See 307.175, and Master comment # 6, Public Meeting Format

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
307.173	Ms.	Megan	Anderson	WELC	06/27/14	For the reasons discussed above, the DEIS prepared by OSM is deficient, and must be redone. As noted above, we ask OSM and the Cooperating Agencies to correct the inadequacies in the DEIS's analysis of impacts, and to provide consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives that include transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and FCPP. Once OSM and the Cooperating Agencies have made the necessary corrections, we request that OSM and the Cooperating Agencies re-issue the DEIS for public comment.	Please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format
308.001		Zane	Galloway		06/27/14	no substantive comment	Thank you for your comment.
309.001	Ms.	Mona	Blaber	Sierra Club Rio Grande Chapter	6/30/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
310.001	Ms.	Lou Ellen	Kay		6/29/2014	, however the environmental impact statement does not give adequate coverage to the serious negative impacts to both the environment and the people of the region that are caused by both the Navajo Mine and the Four Corners Power Plant.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
310.002	Ms.	Lou Ellen	Kay		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
310.003	Ms.	Lou Ellen	Kay		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
311.001	Ms.	Hansen	Peggy		6/29/2014	, however the environmental impact statement does not give adequate coverage to the serious negative impacts to both the environment and the people of the region that are caused by both the Navajo Mine and the Four Corners Power Plant.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
311.002	Ms.	Hansen	Peggy		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
311.003	Ms.	Hansen	Peggy		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
312.001	Mr.	David	Bacon		6/29/2014	, however the environmental impact statement does not give adequate coverage to the serious negative impacts to both the environment and the people of the region that are caused by both the Navajo Mine and the Four Corners Power Plant.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
312.002	Mr.	David	Bacon		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
312.003	Mr.	David	Bacon		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
313.001	Ms.	April	Pitcher		6/29/2014	, however the environmental impact statement does not give adequate coverage to the serious negative impacts to both the environment and the people of the region that are caused by both the Navajo Mine and the Four Corners Power Plant.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
313.002	Ms.	April	Pitcher		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
313.003	Ms.	April	Pitcher		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
314.001	Ms.	Sara	Novenson		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
314.002	Ms.	Sara	Novenson		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
314.003	Ms.	Sara	Novenson		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
315.001	Ms.	Catherine	Chantal		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
315.002	Ms.	Catherine	Chantal		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
315.003	Ms.	Catherine	Chantal		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
316.001	Mr.	Daniel	Sandoval		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
316.002	Mr.	Daniel	Sandoval		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
316.003	Mr.	Daniel	Sandoval		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
317.001	Ms.	Janett	Sarracino		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
317.002	Ms.	Janett	Sarracino		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
317.003	Ms.	Janett	Sarracino		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
318.001	Ms.	Roberta	Bushman		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
318.002	Ms.	Roberta	Bushman		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
318.003	Ms.	Roberta	Bushman		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
319.001	Ms.	Maria-Elena	Chavez		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
319.002	Ms.	Maria-Elena	Chavez		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
319.003	Ms.	Maria-Elena	Chavez		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
320.001	Mr.	Paul	Luehrmann		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
320.002	Mr.	Paul	Luehrmann		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
320.003	Mr.	Paul	Luehrmann		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
321.001	Mr.	William	Baker		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
321.002	Mr.	William	Baker		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
321.003	Mr.	William	Baker		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
322.001	Ms.	Kristina	Fisher		6/29/2014	However, the current Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
322.002	Ms.	Kristina	Fisher		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
322.003	Ms.	Kristina	Fisher		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
323.001	Ms.	Vivek	Dhawan		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
323.002	Ms.	Vivek	Dhawan		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
323.003	Ms.	Vivek	Dhawan		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
324.001	Ms.	Louise	Bradley		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
324.002	Ms.	Louise	Bradley		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
324.003	Ms.	Louise	Bradley		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
325.001	Ms.	Elizabeth	Dunham		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
325.002	Ms.	Elizabeth	Dunham		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
325.003	Ms.	Elizabeth	Dunham		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
326.001	Ms.	Coleen	Maddy		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
326.002	Ms.	Coleen	Maddy		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
326.003	Ms.	Coleen	Maddy		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
327.001	Ms.	Georgena	Felicia		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
327.002	Ms.	Georgena	Felicia		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
327.003	Ms.	Georgena	Felicia		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
328.001	Mr.	Thomas	Carlisle		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
328.002	Mr.	Thomas	Carlisle		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
328.003	Mr.	Thomas	Carlisle		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
329.001	Ms.	Diana	Gries		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
329.002	Ms.	Diana	Gries		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
329.003	Ms.	Diana	Gries		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
330.001	Ms.	Christina	Maris		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
330.002	Ms.	Christina	Maris		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
330.003	Ms.	Christina	Maris		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
331.001	Mr. & Mrs.	David & Caroline	Tapia		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
331.002	Mr. & Mrs.	David & Caroline	Tapia		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
331.003	Mr. & Mrs.	David & Caroline	Tapia		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
332.001	Ms.	Danielle	Rich		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
332.002	Ms.	Danielle	Rich		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
332.003	Ms.	Danielle	Rich		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
333.001	Mr.	Santiago	De Aragon		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
333.002	Mr.	Santiago	De Aragon		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
333.003	Mr.	Santiago	De Aragon		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
334.001	Mr.	Marc	Scullin		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
334.002	Mr.	Marc	Scullin		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
334.003	Mr.	Marc	Scullin		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
335.001		Ulli	Zaczek		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
335.002		Ulli	Zaczek		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
335.003		Ulli	Zaczek		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
336.001	Ms.	Lesley	Jorgensen		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
336.002	Ms.	Lesley	Jorgensen		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
336.003	Ms.	Lesley	Jorgensen		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
337.001	Ms.	Anne	Wilsher		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
337.001	Mr.	Benjamin	Luchini		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
337.002	Ms.	Anne	Wilsher		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
337.002	Mr.	Benjamin	Luchini		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
337.003	Ms.	Anne	Wilsher		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
337.003	Mr.	Benjamin	Luchini		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
338.001	Mr.	John	Marshall		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
338.002	Mr.	John	Marshall		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
338.003	Mr.	John	Marshall		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
339.001	Ms.	Jana	Gunnell		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
339.002	Ms.	Jana	Gunnell		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
339.003	Ms.	Jana	Gunnell		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
340.001	Mr.	Paul	Lewis		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
340.002	Mr.	Paul	Lewis		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
340.003	Mr.	Paul	Lewis		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
341.001	Mr. & Mrs.	Don & Beverly	Lauer		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
341.002	Mr. & Mrs.	Don & Beverly	Lauer		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
341.003	Mr. & Mrs.	Don & Beverly	Lauer		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
343.001	Ms.	Catherine	Neilsen		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
343.002	Ms.	Catherine	Neilsen		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
343.003	Ms.	Catherine	Neilsen		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
344.001	Ms.	Beverly	Rhodes		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
344.002	Ms.	Beverly	Rhodes		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
344.003	Ms.	Beverly	Rhodes		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
345.001	Ms.	Cynthia	Hull		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
345.002	Ms.	Cynthia	Hull		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
345.003	Ms.	Cynthia	Hull		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
346.001	Ms.	Catherine	Williamson		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
346.002	Ms.	Catherine	Williamson		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
346.003	Ms.	Catherine	Williamson		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
347.001	Mr.	Bruce	Poster		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
347.002	Mr.	Bruce	Poster		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
347.003	Mr.	Bruce	Poster		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
348.001	Mr. & Mrs.	Alicia	Pruitt		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
348.002	Mr. & Mrs.	Alicia	Pruitt		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
348.003	Mr. & Mrs.	Alicia	Pruitt		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
349.001	Ms.	Emmi	Whitehorse		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
349.002	Ms.	Emmi	Whitehorse		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
349.003	Ms.	Emmi	Whitehorse		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
350.001	Mr.	Tom	Gorman		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
350.002	Mr.	Tom	Gorman		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
350.003	Mr.	Tom	Gorman		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
351.001		Deepti	Rao		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
351.002		Deepti	Rao		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
351.003		Deepti	Rao		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
352.001	Mr.	Paul	Lusk		6/29/2014	, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
352.002	Mr.	Paul	Lusk		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
352.003	Mr.	Paul	Lusk		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
353.001	Ms.	Sandy	Anderson		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
353.002	Ms.	Sandy	Anderson		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
353.003	Ms.	Sandy	Anderson		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
354.001	Ms.	Susan	Kutz		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
354.002	Ms.	Susan	Kutz		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
354.003	Ms.	Susan	Kutz		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
355.001	Ms.	Ashley	Hansen		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
355.002	Ms.	Ashley	Hansen		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
355.003	Ms.	Ashley	Hansen		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
356.001	Mr.	Gross	Todd		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
356.002	Mr.	Gross	Todd		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
356.003	Mr.	Gross	Todd		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
357.001	Ms.	Sandra	Vieth		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
357.002	Ms.	Sandra	Vieth		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
357.003	Ms.	Sandra	Vieth		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
358.001	Ms.	Dianna	Wynn		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
358.002	Ms.	Dianna	Wynn		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
358.003	Ms.	Dianna	Wynn		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
359.001	Mr.	Bill	Mann		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
359.002	Mr.	Bill	Mann		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
359.003	Mr.	Bill	Mann		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
360.001	Mr.	David	Rosen		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
360.002	Mr.	David	Rosen		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
360.003	Mr.	David	Rosen		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
361.001	Ms.	Mary	Kinninger		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
361.002	Ms.	Mary	Kinninger		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
361.003	Ms.	Mary	Kinninger		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
362.001	Mr.	Dwight	Finkel		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
362.002	Mr.	Dwight	Finkel		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
362.003	Mr.	Dwight	Finkel		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
363.001		Francis	Slater		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
363.002		Francis	Slater		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
363.003		Francis	Slater		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
364.001	Mr.	J. Daniel	Torres		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
364.002	Mr.	J. Daniel	Torres		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
364.003	Mr.	J. Daniel	Torres		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
365.001	Ms.	Carol	Kain		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
365.002	Ms.	Carol	Kain		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
365.003	Ms.	Carol	Kain		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
366.001	Ms.	Shanda	Kruse		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
366.002	Ms.	Shanda	Kruse		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
366.003	Ms.	Shanda	Kruse		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
367.001	Mr.	Edward	Leblanc		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
367.002	Mr.	Edward	Leblanc		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
367.003	Mr.	Edward	Leblanc		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
368.001	Ms.	Katie	Robert		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
368.002	Ms.	Katie	Robert		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
368.003	Ms.	Katie	Robert		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
369.001	Ms.	Karen	Bender		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
369.002	Ms.	Karen	Bender		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
369.003	Ms.	Karen	Bender		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
370.001	Mr.	Greg	Markham		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
370.002	Mr.	Greg	Markham		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
370.003	Mr.	Greg	Markham		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
371.001	Mr.	Wayne	Davis		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
371.002	Mr.	Wayne	Davis		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
371.003	Mr.	Wayne	Davis		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
372.001		M.I.	Morgan		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
372.002		M.I.	Morgan		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
372.003		M.I.	Morgan		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
373.001	Ms.	Deborah	King		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
373.002	Ms.	Deborah	King		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
373.003	Ms.	Deborah	King		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
374.001	Mr.	Thomas	Kindig		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
374.002	Mr.	Thomas	Kindig		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
374.003	Mr.	Thomas	Kindig		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
375.001	Ms.	Ainsley Skye	Waters		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
375.002	Ms.	Ainsley Skye	Waters		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
375.003	Ms.	Ainsley Skye	Waters		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
376.001	Mr.	Max	Hopkins		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
376.002	Mr.	Max	Hopkins		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
376.003	Mr.	Max	Hopkins		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
377.001	Ms.	Dorothy	Brethauer		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
377.002	Ms.	Dorothy	Brethauer		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
377.003	Ms.	Dorothy	Brethauer		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
378.001	Mr.	Stephen	Gilbert		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
378.002	Mr.	Stephen	Gilbert		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
378.003	Mr.	Stephen	Gilbert		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
379.001	Mr.	Jeffrey	Grant		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
379.002	Mr.	Jeffrey	Grant		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
379.003	Mr.	Jeffrey	Grant		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
380.001	Mr.	Chuck	Culpepper		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
380.002	Mr.	Chuck	Culpepper		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
380.003	Mr.	Chuck	Culpepper		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
381.001	Mr.	Mark	Walch		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
381.002	Mr.	Mark	Walch		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
381.003	Mr.	Mark	Walch		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
382.001	Ms.	Marcia	Phillips		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
382.002	Ms.	Marcia	Phillips		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
382.003	Ms.	Marcia	Phillips		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
383.001	Ms.	Mary	Harrison		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
383.002	Ms.	Mary	Harrison		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
383.003	Ms.	Mary	Harrison		6/29/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
384.001	Ms.	Harriet	Katz-Stevens		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
384.002	Ms.	Harriet	Katz-Stevens		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
384.003	Ms.	Harriet	Katz-Stevens		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
385.001	Ms.	Shirlee	Davidson		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
385.002	Ms.	Shirlee	Davidson		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
385.003	Ms.	Shirlee	Davidson		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
386.001		W.	Crafts		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
386.002		W.	Crafts		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
386.003		W.	Crafts		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
387.001	Mr.	Paul	Reed		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
387.002	Mr.	Paul	Reed		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
387.003	Mr.	Paul	Reed		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
388.001	Ms.	Sherry	Butcher		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
388.002	Ms.	Sherry	Butcher		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
388.003	Ms.	Sherry	Butcher		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
389.001	Ms.	Kathryn	Toll		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
389.002	Ms.	Kathryn	Toll		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
389.003	Ms.	Kathryn	Toll		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
390.001	Ms.	Julie	Pederson		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
390.002	Ms.	Julie	Pederson		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
390.003	Ms.	Julie	Pederson		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
391.001		Thouvenin	Laurent		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
391.002		Thouvenin	Laurent		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
391.003		Thouvenin	Laurent		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
392.001	Mr.	Paul	Stoehr		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
392.002	Mr.	Paul	Stoehr		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
392.003	Mr.	Paul	Stoehr		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
393.001	Mr.	James	Reed		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
393.002	Mr.	James	Reed			I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
393.003	Mr.	James	Reed			The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
394.001	Mr.	David	Aldridge		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
394.002	Mr.	David	Aldridge		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
394.003	Mr.	David	Aldridge		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
395.001		Gaia	Mika		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
395.002		Gaia	Mika		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
395.003		Gaia	Mika		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
396.001	Mr.	Richard	Nordland		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
396.002	Mr.	Richard	Nordland		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
396.003	Mr.	Richard	Nordland		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
397.001	Ms.	Doris	Vician		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
397.002	Ms.	Doris	Vician		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
397.003	Ms.	Doris	Vician		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
398.001	Mr.	Bo	Keppel		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
398.002	Mr.	Bo	Keppel		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
398.003	Mr.	Bo	Keppel		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
399.001	Mr.	Robert	Kerwin		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
399.002	Mr.	Robert	Kerwin		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
399.003	Mr.	Robert	Kerwin		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
400.001	Ms.	Betsy	Higgins		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
400.002	Ms.	Betsy	Higgins		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
400.003	Ms.	Betsy	Higgins		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
401.001	Mr.	Randy	Torres		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
401.002	Mr.	Randy	Torres		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
401.003	Mr.	Randy	Torres		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
402.001	Mr.	Charles	Russell		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
402.002	Mr.	Charles	Russell		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
402.003	Mr.	Charles	Russell		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
403.001	Ms.	Sonja	Stalnaker		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
403.002	Ms.	Sonja	Stalnaker		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
403.003	Ms.	Sonja	Stalnaker		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
404.001	Mr.	Norman	Thornton		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
404.002	Mr.	Norman	Thornton		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
404.003	Mr.	Norman	Thornton		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
405.001		Pat	Griffith		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
405.002		Pat	Griffith		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
405.003		Pat	Griffith		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
406.001	Ms.	Patricia	Munoz		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
406.002	Ms.	Patricia	Munoz		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
406.003	Ms.	Patricia	Munoz		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
407.001	Ms.	Claire	McKnight		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
407.002	Ms.	Claire	McKnight		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
407.003	Ms.	Claire	McKnight		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
408.001	Mr.	Tommy	Tomlin		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
408.002	Mr.	Tommy	Tomlin		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
408.003	Mr.	Tommy	Tomlin		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
409.001	Ms.	Marcia	Walton		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
409.002	Ms.	Marcia	Walton		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
409.003	Ms.	Marcia	Walton		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
410.001	Mr.	Jim	Byrnes		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
410.002	Mr.	Jim	Byrnes		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
410.003	Mr.	Jim	Byrnes		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
411.001	Mr.	Doug	Puryear		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
411.002	Mr.	Doug	Puryear		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
411.003	Mr.	Doug	Puryear		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
412.001	Mr.	Joseph	Whiteman		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
412.002	Mr.	Joseph	Whiteman		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
412.003	Mr.	Joseph	Whiteman		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
413.001	Ms.	Linda	Zatopek		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
413.002	Ms.	Linda	Zatopek		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
413.003	Ms.	Linda	Zatopek		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
414.001	Ms.	Laura	Serna		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
414.002	Ms.	Laura	Serna		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
414.003	Ms.	Laura	Serna		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
415.001	Ms.	Sylvia	Seret		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
415.002	Ms.	Sylvia	Seret		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
415.003	Ms.	Sylvia	Seret		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
416.001		Citlalin	Xochime		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
416.002		Citlalin	Xochime		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
416.003		Citlalin	Xochime		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
417.001	Ms.	Shirley	Mcnall		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
417.002	Ms.	Shirley	Mcnall		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
417.003	Ms.	Shirley	Mcnall		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
418.001	Ms.	Ursula	Hofer		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
418.002	Ms.	Ursula	Hofer		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
418.003	Ms.	Ursula	Hofer		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
419.001	Ms.	Marie	Harding		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
419.002	Ms.	Marie	Harding		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
419.003	Ms.	Marie	Harding		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
420.001	Ms.	Mary	Westerlund		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
420.002	Ms.	Mary	Westerlund		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
420.003	Ms.	Mary	Westerlund		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
421.001	Ms.	Diana	Ohlson		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
421.002	Ms.	Diana	Ohlson		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
421.003	Ms.	Diana	Ohlson		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
422.001	Ms.	Kara	Young		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
422.002	Ms.	Kara	Young		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
422.003	Ms.	Kara	Young		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
423.001	Mr.	Erik	Fredrickson		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
423.002	Mr.	Erik	Fredrickson		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
423.003	Mr.	Erik	Fredrickson		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
424.001	Ms.	Sheila	Fox		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
424.002	Ms.	Sheila	Fox		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
424.003	Ms.	Sheila	Fox		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
425.001	Mr.	Norman	Norvelle		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
425.002	Mr.	Norman	Norvelle		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
425.003	Mr.	Norman	Norvelle		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
426.001	Ms.	Christine	Pederson		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
426.002	Ms.	Christine	Pederson		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
426.003	Ms.	Christine	Pederson		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
427.001	Mr.	Sanford	Abrams		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
427.002	Mr.	Sanford	Abrams		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
427.003	Mr.	Sanford	Abrams		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
428.001	Ms.	Teresa	Seamster		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
428.002	Ms.	Teresa	Seamster		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
428.003	Ms.	Teresa	Seamster		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
429.001	Mr.	Nathanael	Brown		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
429.002	Mr.	Nathanael	Brown		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
429.003	Mr.	Nathanael	Brown		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
430.001	Ms.	Sally	Phelps		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
430.002	Ms.	Sally	Phelps		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
430.003	Ms.	Sally	Phelps		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
431.001	Ms.	Joyce	Rubinfeld		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
431.002	Ms.	Joyce	Rubinfeld		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
431.003	Ms.	Joyce	Rubinfeld		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
432.001	Mr.	David	Kennedy		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
432.002	Mr.	David	Kennedy		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
432.003	Mr.	David	Kennedy		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
433.001	Ms.	Helen	Desmith		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
433.002	Ms.	Helen	Desmith		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
433.003	Ms.	Helen	Desmith		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
434.001	Ms.	Susan	Selbin		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
434.002	Ms.	Susan	Selbin		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
434.003	Ms.	Susan	Selbin		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
435.001	Mr.	Thomas	Smith		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
435.002	Mr.	Thomas	Smith		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
435.003	Mr.	Thomas	Smith		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
436.001	Ms.	Jana	Theis		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
436.002	Ms.	Jana	Theis		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
436.003	Ms.	Jana	Theis		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
437.001	Ms.	Michele	Potter		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
437.002	Ms.	Michele	Potter		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
437.003	Ms.	Michele	Potter		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
438.001	Mr.	Peter	Roche		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
438.002	Mr.	Peter	Roche		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
438.003	Mr.	Peter	Roche		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
439.001	Ms.	Tami	Ghafouri		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
439.002	Ms.	Tami	Ghafouri		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
439.003	Ms.	Tami	Ghafouri		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
440.001	Ms.	Marilyn	Hoff		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
440.002	Ms.	Marilyn	Hoff		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
440.003	Ms.	Marilyn	Hoff		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
441.001	Ms.	Regina	Dello Russo		6/28/2014	The EIS needs to assess the full public-health, economic, and climate change impacts to these coal operations from the perspective of our nation's newly emphasized move to cleaner energy	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
441.002	Ms.	Regina	Dello Russo		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
441.003	Ms.	Regina	Dello Russo		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
442.001	Ms.	Tara	Bloyd		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
442.002	Ms.	Tara	Boyd		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
442.003	Ms.	Tara	Boyd		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
443.001		Lem	Powers		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
443.002		Lem	Powers		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
443.003		Lem	Powers		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
444.001	Ms.	Jeanne	Tenorio		6/28/2014	say, if it is not a health risk, why don't you relocate it to Rio Rancho? or the suburbs of Santa Fe?	The location of the FCPP and Navajo Mine are due to the presence of coal resources on the Navajo Nation and agreements between the project proponents and the Navajo Nation government. Since the proposed project is the consideration of continued operations of existing facilities and not siting of a new facility, relocation was not considered as an alternative. With regard to health risks, Section 4.17, specifically pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarize the results of the human health risk assessment conducted for the project.
445.001	Mr.	Robert	Fralick		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
445.002	Mr.	Robert	Fralick		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
445.003	Mr.	Robert	Fralick		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
446.001	Mr.	John	Veth		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
446.002	Mr.	John	Veth		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
446.003	Mr.	John	Veth		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
447.001	Ms.	Susanne	Loyd		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
447.002	Ms.	Susanne	Loyd		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
447.003	Ms.	Susanne	Loyd		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
448.001	Ms.	Tatiana	Druffel		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
448.002	Ms.	Tatiana	Druffel		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
448.003	Ms.	Tatiana	Druffel		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
449.001	Ms.	Amy	Brashear		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
449.002	Ms.	Amy	Brashear		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
449.003	Ms.	Amy	Brashear		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
450.001	Ms.	Karen Jo	Gray		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
450.002	Ms.	Karen Jo	Gray		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
450.003	Ms.	Karen Jo	Gray		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
451.001	Ms.	Barbara	Lenssen		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
451.002	Ms.	Barbara	Lenssen		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
451.003	Ms.	Barbara	Lenssen		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
452.001	Mr.	N. Dean	Ricer		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
452.002	Mr.	N. Dean	Ricer		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
452.003	Mr.	N. Dean	Ricer		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
453.001		Adrian	O'Neill		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
453.002		Adrian	O'Neill		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
453.003		Adrian	O'Neill		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
454.001	Ms.	Patricia	Gourley		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
454.002	Ms.	Patricia	Gourley		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
454.003	Ms.	Patricia	Gourley		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
455.001		Frankie	Benoist		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
455.002		Frankie	Benoist		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
455.003		Frankie	Benoist		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
456.001	Mr.	Paul	Singdahlsen		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
456.002	Mr.	Paul	Singdahlsen		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
456.003	Mr.	Paul	Singdahlsen		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
457.001	Ms.	Kathy	Tate		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
457.002	Ms.	Kathy	Tate		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
457.003	Ms.	Kathy	Tate		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
458.001	Ms.	Yvonne	Griffith		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
458.002	Ms.	Yvonne	Griffith		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
458.003	Ms.	Yvonne	Griffith		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
459.001	Mr.	Daryl	Stanton		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
459.002	Mr.	Daryl	Stanton		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
459.003	Mr.	Daryl	Stanton		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
460.001	Ms.	Judy	Sutton		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
460.002	Ms.	Judy	Sutton		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
460.003	Ms.	Judy	Sutton		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
461.001	Mr.	Hugh	Roberts		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
461.002	Mr.	Hugh	Roberts		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
461.003	Mr.	Hugh	Roberts		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
462.001	Mr.	Andrew	Henry		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
462.002	Mr.	Andrew	Henry		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
462.003	Mr.	Andrew	Henry		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
463.001	Ms.	Jennifer	Edwards		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
463.002	Ms.	Jennifer	Edwards		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
463.003	Ms.	Jennifer	Edwards		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
464.001	Ms.	Judy	Burnett		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
464.002	Ms.	Judy	Burnett		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
464.003	Ms.	Judy	Burnett		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
465.001	Mr.	Stephen	Caldwell		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
465.002	Mr.	Stephen	Caldwell		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
465.003	Mr.	Stephen	Caldwell		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
466.001	Mr.	Philip	Boese		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
466.002	Mr.	Philip	Boese		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
466.003	Mr.	Philip	Boese		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
467.001	Ms.	Wanda	Roach		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
467.002	Ms.	Wanda	Roach		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
467.003	Ms.	Wanda	Roach		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
468.001	Mrs. & Mr.	Jere & Harry	Turner		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
468.002	Mrs. & Mr.	Jere & Harry	Turner		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
468.003	Mrs. & Mr.	Jere & Harry	Turner		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
469.001	Mr.	Tommy	Walton		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
469.002	Mr.	Tommy	Walton		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
469.003	Mr.	Tommy	Walton		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
470.001	Mr.	John	Plummer		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
470.002	Mr.	John	Plummer		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
470.003	Mr.	John	Plummer		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
471.001		Harimander	Khalsa		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
471.002		Harimander	Khalsa		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
471.003		Harimander	Khalsa		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
472.001	Ms.	Leslie	Lakind		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
472.002	Ms.	Leslie	Lakind		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
472.003	Ms.	Leslie	Lakind		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
473.001	Ms.	Joyce	Cousino		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
473.002	Ms.	Joyce	Cousino		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
473.003	Ms.	Joyce	Cousino		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
474.001	Ms.	Patricia	Trujillo		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
474.002	Ms.	Patricia	Trujillo		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
474.003	Ms.	Patricia	Trujillo		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
475.001	Ms.	S. Samantha	Sampson		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
475.002	Ms.	S. Samantha	Sampson		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
475.003	Ms.	S. Samantha	Sampson		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
476.001		Kelly	Garner		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
476.002		Kelly	Garner		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
476.003		Kelly	Garner		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
477.001	Ms.	Marcia	Lincoln		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
477.002	Ms.	Marcia	Lincoln		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
477.003	Ms.	Marcia	Lincoln		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
478.001	Ms.	Carol	Licini		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
478.002	Ms.	Carol	Licini		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
478.003	Ms.	Carol	Licini		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
479.001	Mr.	Bob	Hayes		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
479.002	Mr.	Bob	Hayes		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
479.003	Mr.	Bob	Hayes		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
480.001	Mr.	Patrick	Cooney		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
480.002	Mr.	Patrick	Cooney		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
480.003	Mr.	Patrick	Cooney		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
481.001	Mr.	Richard	Riger		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
481.002	Mr.	Richard	Riger		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
481.003	Mr.	Richard	Riger		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
482.001	Mr.	John	Griego		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
482.002	Mr.	John	Griego		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
482.003	Mr.	John	Griego		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
483.001	Mr.	Malcolm	MacPherson		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
483.002	Mr.	Malcolm	MacPherson		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
483.003	Mr.	Malcolm	MacPherson		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
484.001		R.A.L.	West		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
484.002		R.A.L.	West		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
484.003		R.A.L.	West		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
485.001	Mr.	David	Doty		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
485.002	Mr.	David	Doty		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
485.003	Mr.	David	Doty		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
486.001	Ms.	Carmen	Lieurance		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
486.002	Ms.	Carmen	Lieurance		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
486.003	Ms.	Carmen	Lieurance		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
487.001	Ms.	Lillian	Makeda		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
487.002	Ms.	Lillian	Makeda		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
487.003	Ms.	Lillian	Makeda		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
488.001		Lee	Thompson		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
488.002		Lee	Thompson		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
488.003		Lee	Thompson		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
489.001	Mr.	James	Mackenzie		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
489.002	Mr.	James	Mackenzie		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
489.003	Mr.	James	Mackenzie		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
490.001	Ms.	Diana	Johnson		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
490.002	Ms.	Diana	Johnson		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
490.003	Ms.	Diana	Johnson		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
491.001	Mr.	Eric	Weichmann		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
491.002	Mr.	Eric	Weichmann		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
491.003	Mr.	Eric	Weichmann		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
492.001	Mr.	Jerry	Dukeminier		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
492.002	Mr.	Jerry	Dukeminier		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
492.003	Mr.	Jerry	Dukeminier		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
493.001	Ms.	Jean	Apgar		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
493.002	Ms.	Jean	Apgar		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
493.003	Ms.	Jean	Apgar		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
494.001	Ms.	Janey	Campbell		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
494.002	Ms.	Janey	Campbell		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
494.003	Ms.	Janey	Campbell		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
495.001	Mr.	Kenneth	Mullens		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
495.002	Mr.	Kenneth	Mullens		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
495.003	Mr.	Kenneth	Mullens		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
496.001	Ms.	Deborah	Madison		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
496.002	Ms.	Deborah	Madison		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
496.003	Ms.	Deborah	Madison		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
497.001	Mr.	Darren	Raspa		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
497.002	Mr.	Darren	Raspa		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
497.003	Mr.	Darren	Raspa		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
498.001	Mr.	Marc	Thorne		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
498.002	Mr.	Marc	Thorne		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
498.003	Mr.	Marc	Thorne		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
499.001	Ms.	Janis	Kerr		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
499.002	Ms.	Janis	Kerr		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
499.003	Ms.	Janis	Kerr		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
500.001	Mr.	Jeff	Pfohl		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
500.002	Mr.	Jeff	Pfohl		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
500.003	Mr.	Jeff	Pfohl		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
501.001	Mr.	Stan	Renfro		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
501.002	Mr.	Stan	Renfro		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
501.003	Mr.	Stan	Renfro		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
502.001	Ms.	Mary	Carson		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
502.002	Ms.	Mary	Carson		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
502.003	Ms.	Mary	Carson		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
503.001	Mr.	Laurance	Johnston		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
503.002	Mr.	Laurance	Johnston		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
503.003	Mr.	Laurance	Johnston		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
504.001	Ms.	Constance	West		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
504.002	Ms.	Constance	West		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
504.003	Ms.	Constance	West		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
505.001	Ms.	Sierra	Logan		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
505.002	Ms.	Sierra	Logan		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
505.003	Ms.	Sierra	Logan		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
506.001	Ms.	Laura	Bodmer		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
506.002	Ms.	Laura	Bodmer		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
506.003	Ms.	Laura	Bodmer		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
507.001	Ms.	Margo	Wyse		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
507.002	Ms.	Margo	Wyse		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
507.003	Ms.	Margo	Wyse		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
508.001	Ms.	Emily	Jones		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
508.002	Ms.	Emily	Jones		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
508.003	Ms.	Emily	Jones		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
509.001	Mr.	Dan	Daily		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
509.002	Mr.	Dan	Daily		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
509.003	Mr.	Dan	Daily		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
510.001	Ms.	Joyce	Gonzales		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
510.002	Ms.	Joyce	Gonzales		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
510.003	Ms.	Joyce	Gonzales		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
511.001		Leslie	Byrnes		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
511.002		Leslie	Byrnes		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
511.003		Leslie	Byrnes		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
512.001	Ms.	Judith	Novak		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
512.002	Ms.	Judith	Novak		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
512.003	Ms.	Judith	Novak		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
513.001	Ms.	Lisa	Bowdey		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
513.002	Ms.	Lisa	Bowdey		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
513.003	Ms.	Lisa	Bowdey		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
514.001	Mr.	Matthew	Lyons		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
514.002	Mr.	Matthew	Lyons		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
514.003	Mr.	Matthew	Lyons		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
515.001	Mr.	Bill	Sortino		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
515.002	Mr.	Bill	Sortino		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
515.003	Mr.	Bill	Sortino		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
516.001		Deea	Emmons		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
516.002		Deea	Emmons		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
516.003		Deea	Emmons		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
517.001	Ms.	Patricia	Mihok		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
517.002	Ms.	Patricia	Mihok		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
517.003	Ms.	Patricia	Mihok		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
518.001	Ms.	Anne	Widmark		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
518.002	Ms.	Anne	Widmark		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
518.003	Ms.	Anne	Widmark		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
519.001	Ms.	Judith	Rosenstein		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
519.002	Ms.	Judith	Rosenstein		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
519.003	Ms.	Judith	Rosenstein		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
520.001	Ms.	Cynthia	Lukas		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
520.002	Ms.	Cynthia	Lukas		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
520.003	Ms.	Cynthia	Lukas		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
521.001	Ms.	Debbie	White		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
521.002	Ms.	Debbie	White		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
521.003	Ms.	Debbie	White		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
522.001		Jan	Stone		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
522.002		Jan	Stone		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
522.003		Jan	Stone		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
523.001	Ms.	Sandra	Marshall		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
523.002	Ms.	Sandra	Marshall		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
523.003	Ms.	Sandra	Marshall		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
524.001	Mr.	Earle	Pittman		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
524.002	Mr.	Earle	Pittman		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
524.003	Mr.	Earle	Pittman		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
525.001	Mr.	Steve	Farkash		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
525.002	Mr.	Steve	Farkash		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
525.003	Mr.	Steve	Farkash		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
526.001	Ms.	Nikki	Payne		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
526.002	Ms.	Nikki	Payne		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
526.003	Ms.	Nikki	Payne		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
527.001	Ms.	Polly	Schaafsma		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
527.002	Ms.	Polly	Schaafsma		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
527.003	Ms.	Polly	Schaafsma		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
528.001		Jan	McCreary		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
528.002		Jan	McCreary		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
528.003		Jan	McCreary		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
529.001		Aydin	Gates		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
529.002		Aydin	Gates		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
529.003		Aydin	Gates		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
530.001		Robin	Pascal		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
530.002		Robin	Pascal		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
530.003		Robin	Pascal		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
531.001	Ms.	Andrea	Schnietz		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
531.002	Ms.	Andrea	Schnietz		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
531.003	Ms.	Andrea	Schnietz		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
532.001	Mr. & Mrs.	Eric & Deborah	Shekter		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
532.002	Mr. & Mrs.	Eric & Deborah	Shekter		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
532.003	Mr. & Mrs.	Eric & Deborah	Shekter		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
533.001	Mr. & Mrs.	Steven & Susan	Mayes		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
533.002	Mr. & Mrs.	Steven & Susan	Mayes		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
533.003	Mr. & Mrs.	Steven & Susan	Mayes		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
534.001	Mr.	John	Milloy		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
534.002	Mr.	John	Milloy		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
534.003	Mr.	John	Milloy		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
535.001		Raynera	Mrotek		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
535.002		Raynera	Mrotek		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
535.003		Raynera	Mrotek		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
536.001	Mr.	Tom	Leech		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
536.002	Mr.	Tom	Leech		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
536.003	Mr.	Tom	Leech		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
537.001	Mr.	Derrickson	Moore		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
537.002	Mr.	Derrickson	Moore		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
537.003	Mr.	Derrickson	Moore		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
538.001	Ms.	Natalie	Miller		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
538.002	Ms.	Natalie	Miller		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
538.003	Ms.	Natalie	Miller		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
539.001	Ms.	Lisa	Comfort		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
539.002	Ms.	Lisa	Comfort		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
539.003	Ms.	Lisa	Comfort		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
540.001	Mr.	Richard	Khanlian		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
540.002	Mr.	Richard	Khanlian		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
540.003	Mr.	Richard	Khanlian		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
541.001	Ms.	Debbie	Smith		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
541.002	Ms.	Debbie	Smith		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
541.003	Ms.	Debbie	Smith		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
542.001	Mr.	Fred	Nugent		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
542.002	Mr.	Fred	Nugent		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
542.003	Mr.	Fred	Nugent		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
543.001	Ms.	Carol	Newton		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
543.002	Ms.	Carol	Newton		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
543.003	Ms.	Carol	Newton		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
544.001	Ms.	Cherie	McGinn		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
544.002	Ms.	Cherie	McGinn		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
544.003	Ms.	Cherie	McGinn		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
545.001	Ms.	Joan	Rieck		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
545.002	Ms.	Joan	Rieck		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
545.003	Ms.	Joan	Rieck		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
546.001	Ms.	Mary	Judge		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
546.002	Ms.	Mary	Judge		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
546.003	Ms.	Mary	Judge		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
547.001	Ms.	Mary	Doino		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
547.002	Ms.	Mary	Doino		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
547.003	Ms.	Mary	Doino		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
548.001	Ms.	Susan	Waterman		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
548.002	Ms.	Susan	Waterman		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
548.003	Ms.	Susan	Waterman		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
549.001	Mr.	Jonathan	Hartshorne		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
549.002	Mr.	Jonathan	Hartshorne		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
549.003	Mr.	Jonathan	Hartshorne		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
550.001	Mr.	John	Mcclure		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
550.002	Mr.	John	Mcclure		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
550.003	Mr.	John	Mcclure		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
551.001	Ms.	Theresa	Boracci		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
551.002	Ms.	Theresa	Boracci		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
551.003	Ms.	Theresa	Boracci		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
552.001	Ms.	Dorothy	Kethler		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
552.002	Ms.	Dorothy	Kethler		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
552.003	Ms.	Dorothy	Kethler		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
553.001	Ms.	Dinah	Jentgen		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
553.002	Ms.	Dinah	Jentgen		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
553.003	Ms.	Dinah	Jentgen		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
554.001	Mr.	Henry	Schelton		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
554.002	Mr.	Henry	Schelton		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
554.003	Mr.	Henry	Schelton		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
555.001	Ms.	Carol	Elder		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
555.002	Ms.	Carol	Elder		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
555.003	Ms.	Carol	Elder		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
556.001	Mr. & Mrs.	Lee & Ginger	Levin		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
556.002	Mr. & Mrs.	Lee & Ginger	Levin		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
556.003	Mr. & Mrs.	Lee & Ginger	Levin		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
557.001	Mr. & Mrs.	David & Kandy	Lemoine		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
557.002	Mr. & Mrs.	David & Kandy	Lemoine		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
557.003	Mr. & Mrs.	David & Kandy	Lemoine		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
558.001	Ms.	Barbara	Duncan		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
558.002	Ms.	Barbara	Duncan		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
558.003	Ms.	Barbara	Duncan		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
559.001	Mr.	Nils	Coleman		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
559.002	Mr.	Nils	Coleman		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
559.003	Mr.	Nils	Coleman		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
560.001	Ms.	Glenda	Fletcher		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
560.002	Ms.	Glenda	Fletcher		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
560.003	Ms.	Glenda	Fletcher		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
561.001	Mr.	William	Brown		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
561.002	Mr.	William	Brown		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
561.003	Mr.	William	Brown		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
562.001	Mr.	James	Lin		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
562.002	Mr.	James	Lin		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
562.003	Mr.	James	Lin		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
563.001	Ms.	Katrina	Smith		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
563.002	Ms.	Katrina	Smith		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
563.003	Ms.	Katrina	Smith		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
564.001	Ms.	Ingrid	Butcher		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
564.002	Ms.	Ingrid	Butcher		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
564.003	Ms.	Ingrid	Butcher		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
565.001	Ms.	Kathijane	Alvarado		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
565.002	Ms.	Kathijane	Alvarado		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
565.003	Ms.	Kathijane	Alvarado		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
566.001	Mr.	Jerrold	Osborn		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
566.002	Mr.	Jerrold	Osborn		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
566.003	Mr.	Jerrold	Osborn		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
567.001	Ms.	Libba	Campbell		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
567.002	Ms.	Libba	Campbell		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
567.003	Ms.	Libba	Campbell		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
568.001	Ms.	Elizabeth	Arnold		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
568.002	Ms.	Elizabeth	Arnold		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
568.003	Ms.	Elizabeth	Arnold		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
569.001	Ms.	Sarah	Parker		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
569.002	Ms.	Sarah	Parker		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
569.003	Ms.	Sarah	Parker		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
570.001	Mr.	Spencer	Campbell		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
570.002	Mr.	Spencer	Campbell		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
570.003	Mr.	Spencer	Campbell		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
571.001	Mr.	Joel	Lorimer		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
571.002	Mr.	Joel	Lorimer		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
571.003	Mr.	Joel	Lorimer		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
572.001	Ms.	Janis	Thompson		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
572.002	Ms.	Janis	Thompson		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
572.003	Ms.	Janis	Thompson		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
573.001		Jan	Sharp		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
573.002		Jan	Sharp		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
573.003		Jan	Sharp		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
574.001	Mr. & Mrs.	John & PJ	Liebson		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
574.002	Mr. & Mrs.	John & PJ	Liebson		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
574.003	Mr. & Mrs.	John & PJ	Liebson		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
575.001	Mr.	Scott	Lake		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
575.002	Mr.	Scott	Lake		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
575.003	Mr.	Scott	Lake		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
576.001	Mr.	Martin	Riley		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
576.002	Mr.	Martin	Riley		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
576.003	Mr.	Martin	Riley		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
577.001	Ms.	Sara	Frothingham		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
577.002	Ms.	Sara	Frothingham		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
577.003	Ms.	Sara	Frothingham		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
578.001	Ms.	Lena	Moffitt		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
578.002	Ms.	Lena	Moffitt		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
578.003	Ms.	Lena	Moffitt		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
579.001	Ms.	Catherine	Leslie		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
579.002	Ms.	Catherine	Leslie		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
579.003	Ms.	Catherine	Leslie		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
580.001	Mr.	Kevin	Emmons		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
580.002	Mr.	Kevin	Emmons		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
580.003	Mr.	Kevin	Emmons		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
581.001	Mr.	Jerry	Cronin		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
581.002	Mr.	Jerry	Cronin		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
581.003	Mr.	Jerry	Cronin		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
582.001	Ms.	Joan	Potkay		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
582.002	Ms.	Joan	Potkay		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
582.003	Ms.	Joan	Potkay		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
583.001	Mr.	Chad	Townsend		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
583.002	Mr.	Chad	Townsend		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
583.003	Mr.	Chad	Townsend		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
584.001	Ms.	Sabina	Johnson-Holeson		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
584.002	Ms.	Sabina	Johnson-Holeson		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
584.003	Ms.	Sabina	Johnson-Holeson		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
585.001	Ms.	Rita	Gentry		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
585.002	Ms.	Rita	Gentry		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
585.003	Ms.	Rita	Gentry		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
586.001	Mr.	Gary	Edwards		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
586.002	Mr.	Gary	Edwards		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
586.003	Mr.	Gary	Edwards		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
587.001	Ms.	Suzanne	Simmons		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
587.002	Ms.	Suzanne	Simmons		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
587.003	Ms.	Suzanne	Simmons		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
588.001	Mr.	Duch	Routt		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
588.002	Mr.	Duch	Routt		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
588.003	Mr.	Duch	Routt		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
589.001	Mr. & Mrs.	Jeff & Deborah	Potter		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
589.002	Mr. & Mrs.	Jeff & Deborah	Potter		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
589.003	Mr. & Mrs.	Jeff & Deborah	Potter		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
590.001	Mr.	Doug	Kenfield		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
590.002	Mr.	Doug	Kenfield		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
590.003	Mr.	Doug	Kenfield		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
591.001	Ms.	Marilyn	Rose		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
591.002	Ms.	Marilyn	Rose		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
591.003	Ms.	Marilyn	Rose		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
592.001	Mr.	Joe	Sneed		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
592.002	Mr.	Joe	Sneed		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
592.003	Mr.	Joe	Sneed		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
593.001	Ms.	Mary	Payne		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
593.002	Ms.	Mary	Payne		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
593.003	Ms.	Mary	Payne		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
594.001	Mr.	Charles	Jetty		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
594.002	Mr.	Charles	Jetty		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
594.003	Mr.	Charles	Jetty		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
595.001	Mr.	John	Tomas		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
595.002	Mr.	John	Tomas		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
595.003	Mr.	John	Tomas		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
596.001	Mr.	Bob	Mckee		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
596.002	Mr.	Bob	Mckee		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
596.003	Mr.	Bob	Mckee		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
597.001	Ms.	Susan	Palmer		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
597.002	Ms.	Susan	Palmer		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
597.003	Ms.	Susan	Palmer		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
598.001	Mr.	Fred	Eiland		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
598.002	Mr.	Fred	Eiland		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
598.003	Mr.	Fred	Eiland		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
599.001	Ms.	Virginia	Prihoda		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
599.002	Ms.	Virginia	Prihoda		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
599.003	Ms.	Virginia	Prihoda		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
600.001	Ms.	Priscilla	Saulsgiver		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
600.002	Ms.	Priscilla	Saulsgiver		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
600.003	Ms.	Priscilla	Saulsgiver		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
601.001	Ms.	Christina	Heffner		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
601.002	Ms.	Christina	Heffner		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
601.003	Ms.	Christina	Heffner		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
602.001	Mr.	Dennis	Schneider		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
602.002	Mr.	Dennis	Schneider		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
602.003	Mr.	Dennis	Schneider		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
603.001	Ms.	Joanne	Quintana		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
603.002	Ms.	Joanne	Quintana		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
603.003	Ms.	Joanne	Quintana		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
604.001	Ms.	Barbara	Reser		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
604.002	Ms.	Barbara	Reser		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
604.003	Ms.	Barbara	Reser		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
605.001	Ms.	Brenda	Manning		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
605.002	Ms.	Brenda	Manning		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
605.003	Ms.	Brenda	Manning		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
606.001	Ms.	Judy	Mccarthy		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
606.002	Ms.	Judy	Mccarthy		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
606.003	Ms.	Judy	Mccarthy		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
607.001	Mr.	Robert	Stires		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
607.002	Mr.	Robert	Stires		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
607.003	Mr.	Robert	Stires		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
608.001		J.	Tilley		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
608.002		J.	Tilley		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
608.003		J.	Tilley		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
609.001	Mr.	James	Huesers		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
609.002	Mr.	James	Huesers		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
609.003	Mr.	James	Huesers		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
610.001	Mr.	Frank	Mcclure		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
610.002	Mr.	Frank	Mcclure		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
610.003	Mr.	Frank	Mcclure		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
611.001	Mr.	James	Wallin		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
611.002	Mr.	James	Wallin		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
611.003	Mr.	James	Wallin		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
612.001	Ms.	Denise	Shreeve		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
612.002	Ms.	Denise	Shreeve		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
612.003	Ms.	Denise	Shreeve		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
613.001	Mr.	Bill	Tiwald		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
613.002	Mr.	Bill	Tiwald		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
613.003	Mr.	Bill	Tiwald		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
614.001	Mr.	Dale	Barnes		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
614.002	Mr.	Dale	Barnes		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
614.003	Mr.	Dale	Barnes		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
615.001	Mr.	Aaron	Taylor		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
615.002	Mr.	Aaron	Taylor		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
615.003	Mr.	Aaron	Taylor		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
616.001	Ms.	Kate	Inglis		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
616.002	Ms.	Kate	Inglis		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
616.003	Ms.	Kate	Inglis		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
617.001	Ms.	Deborah	Johnson		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
617.002	Ms.	Deborah	Johnson		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
617.003	Ms.	Deborah	Johnson		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
618.001	Mr.	Ronald	Tye		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
618.002	Mr.	Ronald	Tye		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
618.003	Mr.	Ronald	Tye		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
619.001		Chris	Wismer		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
619.002		Chris	Wismer		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
619.003		Chris	Wismer		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
620.001	Mr.	Ronald	Shank		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
620.002	Mr.	Ronald	Shank		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
620.003	Mr.	Ronald	Shank		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
621.001	Ms.	Nancy	Shelton		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
621.002	Ms.	Nancy	Shelton		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
621.003	Ms.	Nancy	Shelton		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
622.001	Ms.	Tanya	Field		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
622.002	Ms.	Tanya	Field		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
622.003	Ms.	Tanya	Field		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
623.001	Mr.	James	Huse		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
623.002	Mr.	James	Huse		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
623.003	Mr.	James	Huse		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
624.001	Ms.	Marjorie	Johnson		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
624.002	Ms.	Marjorie	Johnson		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
624.003	Ms.	Marjorie	Johnson		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
625.001	Ms.	Mary	Ray		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
625.002	Ms.	Mary	Ray		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
625.003	Ms.	Mary	Ray		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
626.001	Mr.	Sully	Wilson		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
626.002	Mr.	Sully	Wilson		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
626.003	Mr.	Sully	Wilson		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
627.001	Ms.	Adele	Strasser		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
627.002	Ms.	Adele	Strasser		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
627.003	Ms.	Adele	Strasser		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
628.001	Ms.	Catherine	Jobling		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
628.002	Ms.	Catherine	Jobling		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
628.003	Ms.	Catherine	Jobling		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
629.001	Ms.	Cara	McCulloch		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
629.002	Ms.	Cara	McCulloch		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
629.003	Ms.	Cara	McCulloch		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
630.001	Ms.	Rebecca	Kraimer		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
630.002	Ms.	Rebecca	Kraimer		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
630.003	Ms.	Rebecca	Kraimer		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
631.001	Ms.	Catherine	Lynch		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
631.002	Ms.	Catherine	Lynch		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
631.003	Ms.	Catherine	Lynch		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
632.001	Mr.	Mark	Wood		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
632.002	Mr.	Mark	Wood		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
632.003	Mr.	Mark	Wood		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
633.001	Ms.	Vikki	Melnick		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
633.002	Ms.	Vikki	Melnick		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
633.003	Ms.	Vikki	Melnick		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
634.001	Ms.	Amanda	Graham		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
634.002	Ms.	Amanda	Graham		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
634.003	Ms.	Amanda	Graham		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
635.001	Mr.	Peter R.	Christensen		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
635.002	Mr.	Peter R.	Christensen		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
635.003	Mr.	Peter R.	Christensen		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
636.001	Mr.	Barry	Neumann		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
636.002	Mr.	Barry	Neumann		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
636.003	Mr.	Barry	Neumann		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
637.001		Jami	Shaver		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
637.002		Jami	Shaver		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
637.003		Jami	Shaver		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
638.001	Ms.	Helen	Rynaski		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
638.002	Ms.	Helen	Rynaski		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
638.003	Ms.	Helen	Rynaski		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
639.001	Mr. & Mrs.	David & Melanie	Smith		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
639.002	Mr. & Mrs.	David & Melanie	Smith		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
639.003	Mr. & Mrs.	David & Melanie	Smith		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
640.001	Ms.	Sally	Wright		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
640.002	Ms.	Sally	Wright		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
640.003	Ms.	Sally	Wright		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
641.001	Mr.	Daniel	Stevens		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
641.002	Mr.	Daniel	Stevens		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
641.003	Mr.	Daniel	Stevens		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
642.001		Kj	Kaye		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
642.002		Kj	Kaye		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
642.003		Kj	Kaye		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
643.001	Ms.	Diana	Witzel		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
643.002	Ms.	Diana	Witzel		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
643.003	Ms.	Diana	Witzel		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
644.001		Kary	Pierce		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
644.002		Kary	Pierce		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
644.003		Kary	Pierce		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
645.001	Ms.	Janetta	Bernier		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
645.002	Ms.	Janetta	Bernier		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
645.003	Ms.	Janetta	Bernier		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
646.001	Mr.	Herman	Rummelt		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
646.002	Mr.	Herman	Rummelt		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
646.003	Mr.	Herman	Rummelt		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
647.001	Ms.	Georgia	Meyer-Hayes		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
647.002	Ms.	Georgia	Meyer-Hayes		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
647.003	Ms.	Georgia	Meyer-Hayes		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
648.001	Mr.	Dick	Hogle		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
648.002	Mr.	Dick	Hogle		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
648.003	Mr.	Dick	Hogle		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
649.001	Ms.	Pamela	Bell		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
649.002	Ms.	Pamela	Bell		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
649.003	Ms.	Pamela	Bell		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
650.001	Mr.	Eddie	Soloway		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
650.002	Mr.	Eddie	Soloway		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
650.003	Mr.	Eddie	Soloway		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
651.001	Mr.	Michael	Carey		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
651.002	Mr.	Michael	Carey		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
651.003	Mr.	Michael	Carey		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
652.001	Ms.	Sheila	Montoya		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
652.001	Ms.	Sheila	Montoya		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
652.003	Ms.	Sheila	Montoya		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
653.001	Ms.	Coleen	Vicenti		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
653.001	Ms.	Coleen	Vicenti		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
653.001	Ms.	Coleen	Vicenti		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
654.001	Mr.	Dwight	Nibbelink		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
654.001	Mr.	Dwight	Nibbelink		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
654.001	Mr.	Dwight	Nibbelink		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
655.001		Geri	Rhodes		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
655.001		Geri	Rhodes		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
655.001		Geri	Rhodes		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
656.001		Aj	Rascon		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
656.002		Aj	Rascon		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
656.003		Aj	Rascon		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
657.001	Ms.	Margery	Johnson		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
657.002	Ms.	Margery	Johnson		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
657.003	Ms.	Margery	Johnson		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
658.001	Mr.	Jay	Gould		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
658.002	Mr.	Jay	Gould		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
658.003	Mr.	Jay	Gould		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
659.001	Ms.	Karla	Koch		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
659.002	Ms.	Karla	Koch		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
659.003	Ms.	Karla	Koch		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
660.001	Ms.	Marifrank	Daharb		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
660.002	Ms.	Marifrank	Daharb		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
660.003	Ms.	Marifrank	Daharb		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
661.001	Ms.	Peaches	Bellini		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
661.002	Ms.	Peaches	Bellini		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
661.003	Ms.	Peaches	Bellini		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
662.001	Mr.	Frank	Croft		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
662.002	Mr.	Frank	Croft		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
662.003	Mr.	Frank	Croft		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
663.001	Mr.	James	Holloway		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
663.002	Mr.	James	Holloway		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
663.003	Mr.	James	Holloway		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
664.001	Ms.	Carol	Winkel		6/28/2014	unfortunately, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequate address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
664.002	Ms.	Carol	Winkel		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
664.003	Ms.	Carol	Winkel		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
665.001	Ms.	Mary	Scott		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
665.002	Ms.	Mary	Scott		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
665.003	Ms.	Mary	Scott		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
666.001	Ms.	Andrea	Castellanos		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
666.002	Ms.	Andrea	Castellanos		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
666.003	Ms.	Andrea	Castellanos		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
667.001	Ms.	Joyce	Carlson-Leavitt		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
667.002	Ms.	Joyce	Carlson-Leavitt		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
667.003	Ms.	Joyce	Carlson-Leavitt		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
668.001	Ms.	Stacey	Ward		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
668.002	Ms.	Stacey	Ward		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
668.003	Ms.	Stacey	Ward		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
669.001	Mr.	Derek	Bloom		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
669.002	Mr.	Derek	Bloom		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
669.003	Mr.	Derek	Bloom		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
670.001	Ms.	Gina	Welde		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
670.002	Ms.	Gina	Welde		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
670.003	Ms.	Gina	Welde		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
671.001	Mr.	Donald	Miller		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
671.002	Mr.	Donald	Miller		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
671.003	Mr.	Donald	Miller		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
672.001	Mrs. & Mr.	Janet & Joseph	Eigner		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
672.002	Mrs. & Mr.	Janet & Joseph	Eigner		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
672.003	Mrs. & Mr.	Janet & Joseph	Eigner		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
673.001	Ms.	Janet	Mura		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
673.002	Ms.	Janet	Mura		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
673.003	Ms.	Janet	Mura		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
674.001	Mr.	Robert	Rosas		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
674.002	Mr.	Robert	Rosas		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
674.003	Mr.	Robert	Rosas		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
675.001	Ms.	Ilene	Diamond		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
675.002	Ms.	Ilene	Diamond		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
675.003	Ms.	Ilene	Diamond		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
676.001	Ms.	Delilah	Nichols		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
676.002	Ms.	Delilah	Nichols		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
676.003	Ms.	Delilah	Nichols		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
677.001	Mr.	Richard	Cooley		6/28/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
677.002	Mr.	Richard	Cooley		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
677.003	Mr.	Richard	Cooley		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
678.001	Mr.	Larry	Littlefield		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
678.002	Mr.	Larry	Littlefield		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
678.003	Mr.	Larry	Littlefield		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
679.001	Mr.	John	Ford		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
679.002	Mr.	John	Ford		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
679.003	Mr.	John	Ford		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
680.001	Ms.	Sandra	Keene		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
680.002	Ms.	Sandra	Keene		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
680.003	Ms.	Sandra	Keene		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
681.001	Ms.	Nancy	Wheeler		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
681.002	Ms.	Nancy	Wheeler		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
681.003	Ms.	Nancy	Wheeler		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
682.001	Ms.	Nicole	Sylvester		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
682.002	Ms.	Nicole	Sylvester		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
682.003	Ms.	Nicole	Sylvester		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
683.001		Le	Martinez		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
683.002		Le	Martinez		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
683.003		Le	Martinez		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
684.001	Ms.	Lois	Owens		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
684.002	Ms.	Lois	Owens		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
684.003	Ms.	Lois	Owens		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
685.001	Mr. & Mrs.	Anthony & Patricia	Schroeder		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
685.002	Mr. & Mrs.	Anthony & Patricia	Schroeder		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
685.003	Mr. & Mrs.	Anthony & Patricia	Schroeder		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
686.001	Ms.	Mary	DeLuca		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
686.002	Ms.	Mary	DeLuca		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
686.003	Ms.	Mary	DeLuca		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
687.001	Mr.	Tim	Sierra		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
687.002	Mr.	Tim	Sierra		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
687.003	Mr.	Tim	Sierra		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
688.001	Ms.	Joan	Quinn		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
688.002	Ms.	Joan	Quinn		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
688.003	Ms.	Joan	Quinn		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
689.001	Ms.	Loralyn	Conover		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
689.002	Ms.	Loralyn	Conover		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
689.003	Ms.	Loralyn	Conover		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
690.001	Ms.	Julie	Brokken		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
690.002	Ms.	Julie	Brokken		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
690.003	Ms.	Julie	Brokken		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
691.001	Ms.	Angela	Welford		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
691.002	Ms.	Angela	Welford		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
691.003	Ms.	Angela	Welford		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
692.001	Ms.	Mary Ann	Briody		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
692.002	Ms.	Mary Ann	Briody		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
692.003	Ms.	Mary Ann	Briody		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
693.001	Mrs. & Mr.	Pat & Gary	Duncan		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
693.002	Mrs. & Mr.	Pat & Gary	Duncan		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
693.003	Mrs. & Mr.	Pat & Gary	Duncan		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
694.001	Ms.	Katherine	Ranck		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
694.002	Ms.	Katherine	Ranck		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
694.003	Ms.	Katherine	Ranck		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
695.001	Mr.	Arnold	Lieberman		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
695.002	Mr.	Arnold	Lieberman		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
695.003	Mr.	Arnold	Lieberman		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
696.001	Ms.	Virginia	Davis		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
696.002	Ms.	Virginia	Davis		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
696.003	Ms.	Virginia	Davis		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
697.001	Ms.	Harriette	Lawler		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
697.002	Ms.	Harriette	Lawler		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
697.003	Ms.	Harriette	Lawler		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
698.001	Ms.	Susan	Ostlie		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
698.002	Ms.	Susan	Ostlie		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
698.003	Ms.	Susan	Ostlie		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
699.001	Ms.	Kathryn	Turnipseed		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
699.002	Ms.	Kathryn	Turnipseed		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
699.003	Ms.	Kathryn	Turnipseed		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
700.001	Ms.	Thelma	Flowers		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
700.002	Ms.	Thelma	Flowers		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
700.003	Ms.	Thelma	Flowers		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
701.001	Mr.	Gerald	Quintana		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
701.002	Mr.	Gerald	Quintana		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
701.003	Mr.	Gerald	Quintana		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
702.001	Mr.	David	Gick		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
702.002	Mr.	David	Gick		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
702.003	Mr.	David	Gick		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
703.001	Ms.	Michele	Spiro		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
703.002	Ms.	Michele	Spiro		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
703.003	Ms.	Michele	Spiro		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
704.001	Mr.	Lawrence	Page, Jr.		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
704.002	Mr.	Lawrence	Page, Jr.		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
704.003	Mr.	Lawrence	Page, Jr.		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
705.001	Ms.	Anne	Malone		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
705.002	Ms.	Anne	Malone		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
705.003	Ms.	Anne	Malone		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
706.001	Mr.	Gerald	Biamont		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
706.002	Mr.	Gerald	Biamont		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
706.003	Mr.	Gerald	Biamont		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
707.001		Carlin	Freeman		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
707.002		Carlin	Freeman		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
707.003		Carlin	Freeman		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
708.001		Gaetane	Gonzales		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
708.002		Gaetane	Gonzales		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
708.003		Gaetane	Gonzales		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
709.001	Mr.	Wayne	Kirkby		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
709.002	Mr.	Wayne	Kirkby		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
709.003	Mr.	Wayne	Kirkby		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
710.001	Mr.	Tom	Ruhl		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
710.002	Mr.	Tom	Ruhl		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
710.003	Mr.	Tom	Ruhl		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
711.001	Ms.	Mona	Grigsby-Suarez		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
711.002	Ms.	Mona	Grigsby-Suarez		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
711.003	Ms.	Mona	Grigsby-Suarez		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
712.001	Mr.	John	Buchser		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
712.002	Mr.	John	Buchser		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
712.003	Mr.	John	Buchser		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
713.001	Ms.	Emily	Lucero		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
713.002	Ms.	Emily	Lucero		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
713.003	Ms.	Emily	Lucero		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
714.001	Ms.	Gale	Litvak		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
714.002	Ms.	Gale	Litvak		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
714.003	Ms.	Gale	Litvak		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
715.001	Mr.	David	Medina		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
715.002	Mr.	David	Medina		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
715.003	Mr.	David	Medina		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
716.001	Ms.	Stephanie	Vorse		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
716.002	Ms.	Stephanie	Vorse		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
716.003	Ms.	Stephanie	Vorse		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
717.001	Ms.	Laurie	Morris		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
717.002	Ms.	Laurie	Morris		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
717.003	Ms.	Laurie	Morris		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
718.001		Jan	Novak		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
718.002		Jan	Novak		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
718.003		Jan	Novak		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
719.001	Ms.	Linda	Thompson		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
719.002	Ms.	Linda	Thompson		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
719.003	Ms.	Linda	Thompson		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
720.001	Ms.	Rita	Rachkowski		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
720.002	Ms.	Rita	Rachkowski		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
720.003	Ms.	Rita	Rachkowski		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
721.001	Ms.	Susan	Fritts		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
721.002	Ms.	Susan	Fritts		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
721.003	Ms.	Susan	Fritts		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
722.001	Ms.	Donna	Kubiak		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
722.002	Ms.	Donna	Kubiak		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
722.003	Ms.	Donna	Kubiak		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
723.001	Ms.	Mary	Toll		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
723.002	Ms.	Mary	Toll		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
723.003	Ms.	Mary	Toll		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
724.001	Mr.	Matthew	Draper		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
724.002	Mr.	Matthew	Draper		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
724.003	Mr.	Matthew	Draper		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
725.001	Mr.	Mark	Bohrer		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
725.002	Mr.	Mark	Bohrer		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
725.003	Mr.	Mark	Bohrer		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
726.001	Mr.	Scott	Moore		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
726.002	Mr.	Scott	Moore		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
726.003	Mr.	Scott	Moore		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
727.001	Mr.	Homer	Guy		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
727.002	Mr.	Homer	Guy		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
727.003	Mr.	Homer	Guy		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
728.001	Mr.	Frank	Hardin		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
728.002	Mr.	Frank	Hardin		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
728.003	Mr.	Frank	Hardin		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
729.001	Ms.	Lucie	Brennan		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
729.002	Ms.	Lucie	Brennan		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
729.003	Ms.	Lucie	Brennan		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
730.001	Ms.	Linda	Hodapp		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
730.002	Ms.	Linda	Hodapp		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
730.003	Ms.	Linda	Hodapp		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
731.001		Terry	Thompson		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
731.002		Terry	Thompson		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
731.003		Terry	Thompson		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
732.001	Ms.	Elaine	Peabody		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
732.002	Ms.	Elaine	Peabody		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
732.003	Ms.	Elaine	Peabody		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
733.001	Mr.	Dirk	Kortz		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
733.002	Mr.	Dirk	Kortz		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
733.003	Mr.	Dirk	Kortz		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
734.001	Ms.	Gigi	Kast		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
734.002	Ms.	Gigi	Kast		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
734.003	Ms.	Gigi	Kast		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
735.001	Ms.	Patricia	Esparza		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
735.002	Ms.	Patricia	Esparza		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
735.003	Ms.	Patricia	Esparza		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
736.001	Ms.	Jill	Frawley		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
736.002	Ms.	Jill	Frawley		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
736.003	Ms.	Jill	Frawley		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
737.001	Mr.	Ronald	Tye		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
737.002	Mr.	Ronald	Tye		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
737.003	Mr.	Ronald	Tye		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
738.001	Mr.	William	Griffin		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
738.002	Mr.	William	Griffin		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
738.003	Mr.	William	Griffin		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
739.001		Ysha	Oakes		6/27/2014	Your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
739.002		Ysha	Oakes		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
739.003		Ysha	Oakes		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
740.001	Ms.	Judy	Paulsen		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
740.002	Ms.	Judy	Paulsen		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
740.003	Ms.	Judy	Paulsen		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
741.001	Mr.	Charles	Clements		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
741.002	Mr.	Charles	Clements		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
741.003	Mr.	Charles	Clements		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
742.001	Mr.	Daniel	Samek		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
742.002	Mr.	Daniel	Samek		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
742.003	Mr.	Daniel	Samek		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
743.001	Ms.	Mary Ann	O'Donnell		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
743.002	Ms.	Mary Ann	O'Donnell		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
743.003	Ms.	Mary Ann	O'Donnell		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
744.001	Ms.	Barbara	Calef		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
744.002	Ms.	Barbara	Calef		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
744.003	Ms.	Barbara	Calef		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
745.001	Mr.	Patrick	Jones		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
745.002	Mr.	Patrick	Jones		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
745.003	Mr.	Patrick	Jones		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
746.001	Mr.	Dean	Strassburger		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
746.002	Mr.	Dean	Strassburger		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
746.003	Mr.	Dean	Strassburger		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
747.001		Frances	Jessop		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
747.002		Frances	Jessop		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
747.003		Frances	Jessop		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
748.001	Mrs. & Mr.	Jane & Timothy	Sawina		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
748.002	Mrs. & Mr.	Jane & Timothy	Sawina		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
748.003	Mrs. & Mr.	Jane & Timothy	Sawina		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
749.001	Mr.	Bo	Bergstrom		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
749.002	Mr.	Bo	Bergstrom		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
749.003	Mr.	Bo	Bergstrom		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
750.001	Ms.	Elisabeth	Price		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
750.002	Ms.	Elisabeth	Price		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
750.003	Ms.	Elisabeth	Price		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
751.001	Ms.	Tana	Hemingway		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
751.002	Ms.	Tana	Hemingway		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
751.003	Ms.	Tana	Hemingway		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
752.001	Ms.	Juanita	Lumpmouth		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
752.002	Ms.	Juanita	Lumpmouth		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
752.003	Ms.	Juanita	Lumpmouth		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
753.001	Mr.	Lloyd	Goding		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
753.002	Mr.	Lloyd	Goding		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
753.003	Mr.	Lloyd	Goding		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
754.001	Ms.	Louise	Hummingbird		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
754.002	Ms.	Louise	Hummingbird		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
754.003	Ms.	Louise	Hummingbird		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
755.001	Ms.	Linda	Howe		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
755.002	Ms.	Linda	Howe		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
755.003	Ms.	Linda	Howe		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
756.001	Ms.	Susan	Lea		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
756.002	Ms.	Susan	Lea		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
756.003	Ms.	Susan	Lea		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
757.001	Ms.	Renee	Kenneybrew		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
757.002	Ms.	Renee	Kenneybrew		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
757.003	Ms.	Renee	Kenneybrew		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
758.001	Ms.	Amy	Levi		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
758.002	Ms.	Amy	Levi		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
758.003	Ms.	Amy	Levi		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
759.001	Ms.	Katherine	Blagden		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
759.002	Ms.	Katherine	Blagden		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
759.003	Ms.	Katherine	Blagden		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
760.001	Mr.	Peter	Fesenden		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
760.002	Mr.	Peter	Fesenden		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
760.003	Mr.	Peter	Fesenden		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
761.001	Ms.	Maria	Jaunakais		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
761.002	Ms.	Maria	Jaunakais		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
761.003	Ms.	Maria	Jaunakais		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
762.001	Ms.	Judith	Anastasio		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
762.002	Ms.	Judith	Anastasio		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
762.003	Ms.	Judith	Anastasio		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
763.001	Mr.	Sean	Price		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
763.002	Mr.	Sean	Price		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
763.003	Mr.	Sean	Price		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
764.001	Ms.	Linda	Lillow		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
764.002	Ms.	Linda	Lillow		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
764.003	Ms.	Linda	Lillow		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
765.001	Ms.	Susan	Diaz		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
765.002	Ms.	Susan	Diaz		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
765.003	Ms.	Susan	Diaz		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
766.001	Mr.	Stephen	Fischmann		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
766.002	Mr.	Stephen	Fischmann		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
766.003	Mr.	Stephen	Fischmann		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
767.001	Ms.	Barbara	Davis		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
767.002	Ms.	Barbara	Davis		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
767.003	Ms.	Barbara	Davis		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
768.001	Mr.	Alex	Pigeon		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
768.002	Mr.	Alex	Pigeon		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
768.003	Mr.	Alex	Pigeon		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
769.001	Ms.	Stephanie	Shine		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
769.002	Ms.	Stephanie	Shine		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
769.003	Ms.	Stephanie	Shine		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
770.001	Mr.	Charles	Yurchak		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
770.002	Mr.	Charles	Yurchak		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
770.003	Mr.	Charles	Yurchak		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
771.001		Sidney	Ash		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
771.002		Sidney	Ash		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
771.003		Sidney	Ash		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
772.001	Mr.	Bruce	Papier		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
772.002	Mr.	Bruce	Papier		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
772.003	Mr.	Bruce	Papier		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
773.001	Ms.	Shelley	Payne		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
773.002	Ms.	Shelley	Payne		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
773.003	Ms.	Shelley	Payne		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
774.001	Mr.	Lorenzo	Perez		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
774.002	Mr.	Lorenzo	Perez		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
774.003	Mr.	Lorenzo	Perez		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
775.001		J.D.	Weinberg		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
775.002		J.D.	Weinberg		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
775.003		J.D.	Weinberg		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
776.001	Ms.	Yvonne	Ricard		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
776.002	Ms.	Yvonne	Ricard		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
776.003	Ms.	Yvonne	Ricard		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
777.001	Ms.	Myra	Armstrong		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
777.002	Ms.	Myra	Armstrong		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
777.003	Ms.	Myra	Armstrong		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
778.001	Mr.	William	Pagel		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
778.002	Mr.	William	Pagel		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
778.003	Mr.	William	Pagel		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
779.001	Ms.	Margarita	Sanchez		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
779.002	Ms.	Margarita	Sanchez		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
779.003	Ms.	Margarita	Sanchez		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
780.001	Ms.	Laureen	Pepersack		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
780.002	Ms.	Laureen	Pepersack		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
780.003	Ms.	Laureen	Pepersack		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
781.001		Mo	Emery		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
781.002		Mo	Emery		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
781.003		Mo	Emery		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
782.001	Ms.	Eden	Maxwell		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
782.002	Ms.	Eden	Maxwell		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
782.003	Ms.	Eden	Maxwell		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
783.001	Mr.	Roger	Ball		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
783.002	Mr.	Roger	Ball		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
783.003	Mr.	Roger	Ball		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
784.001	Ms.	Karen	Boehler		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
784.002	Ms.	Karen	Boehler		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
784.003	Ms.	Karen	Boehler		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
785.001	Ms.	Karen	Halderson		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
785.002	Ms.	Karen	Halderson		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
785.003	Ms.	Karen	Halderson		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
786.001	Mr.	John	Wernsdorfer		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
786.002	Mr.	John	Wernsdorfer		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
786.003	Mr.	John	Wernsdorfer		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
787.001	Ms.	Barbara	Mader		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
787.002	Ms.	Barbara	Mader		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
787.003	Ms.	Barbara	Mader		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
788.001		C.	Johnson		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
788.002		C.	Johnson		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
788.003		C.	Johnson		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
789.001	Ms.	Sandra	Keene		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
789.002	Ms.	Sandra	Keene		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
789.003	Ms.	Sandra	Keene		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
790.001	Ms.	Mary	Robert		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
790.002	Ms.	Mary	Robert		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
790.003	Ms.	Mary	Robert		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
791.001	Ms.	Deirdre	Campbell		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
791.002	Ms.	Deirdre	Campbell		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
791.003	Ms.	Deirdre	Campbell		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
792.001	Dr.	Paul	Watson		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
792.002	Dr.	Paul	Watson		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
792.003	Dr.	Paul	Watson		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
793.001	Ms.	Mary	McCormick		6/27/2014	Your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
793.002	Ms.	Mary	McCormick		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
793.003	Ms.	Mary	McCormick		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
794.001	Mr.	Edwin	Covington		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
794.002	Mr.	Edwin	Covington		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
794.003	Mr.	Edwin	Covington		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
795.001	Mr.	Al	Webster		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
795.002	Mr.	Al	Webster		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
795.003	Mr.	Al	Webster		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
796.001	Mr.	Berry	Ives		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
796.002	Mr.	Berry	Ives		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
796.003	Mr.	Berry	Ives		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
797.001		Jet	Ezra		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
797.002		Jet	Ezra		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
797.003		Jet	Ezra		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
798.001	Ms.	Ann Ellen	Tuomey		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
798.002	Ms.	Ann Ellen	Tuomey		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
798.003	Ms.	Ann Ellen	Tuomey		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
799.001	Ms.	Clara	Zschaler		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
799.002	Ms.	Clara	Zschaler		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
799.003	Ms.	Clara	Zschaler		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
800.001		Samat	Jain		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
800.002		Samat	Jain		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
800.003		Samat	Jain		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
801.001	Mr.	David	Johnson		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
801.002	Mr.	David	Johnson		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
801.003	Mr.	David	Johnson		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
802.001	Ms.	Charlotte	Shirley		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
802.002	Ms.	Charlotte	Shirley		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
802.003	Ms.	Charlotte	Shirley		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
803.001	Mr.	Bryan	Williamson		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
803.002	Mr.	Bryan	Williamson		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
803.003	Mr.	Bryan	Williamson		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
804.001	Mr.	Jack	Partridge		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
804.002	Mr.	Jack	Partridge		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
804.003	Mr.	Jack	Partridge		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
805.001	Mr.	Glenn	Bowen		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
805.002	Mr.	Glenn	Bowen		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
805.003	Mr.	Glenn	Bowen		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
806.001	Ms.	Belle	Hollon		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
806.002	Ms.	Belle	Hollon		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
806.003	Ms.	Belle	Hollon		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
807.001	Mr.	Steve	Swarner		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
807.002	Mr.	Steve	Swarner		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
807.003	Mr.	Steve	Swarner		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
808.001	Ms.	Barbara	Troje		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
808.002	Ms.	Barbara	Troje		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
808.003	Ms.	Barbara	Troje		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
809.001	Mr.	Gary	Harmon		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
809.002	Mr.	Gary	Harmon		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
809.003	Mr.	Gary	Harmon		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
810.001	Mr.	Daniel	O'Driscoll		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
810.002	Mr.	Daniel	O'Driscoll		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
810.003	Mr.	Daniel	O'Driscoll		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
811.001	Mr. & Mrs.	Dan & Linnea	Poretti		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
811.002	Mr. & Mrs.	Dan & Linnea	Poretti		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
811.003	Mr. & Mrs.	Dan & Linnea	Poretti		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
812.001	Ms.	Diane	La France		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
812.002	Ms.	Diane	La France		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
812.003	Ms.	Diane	La France		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
813.001	Ms.	Kathleen	Buckley		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
813.002	Ms.	Kathleen	Buckley		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
813.003	Ms.	Kathleen	Buckley		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
814.001	Ms.	Crystal	Wolf		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
814.002	Ms.	Crystal	Wolf		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
814.003	Ms.	Crystal	Wolf		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
815.001	Mr.	Eric	Bottomly		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
815.002	Mr.	Eric	Bottomly		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
815.003	Mr.	Eric	Bottomly		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
816.001	Ms.	Barbara	Sundberg		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
816.002	Ms.	Barbara	Sundberg		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
816.003	Ms.	Barbara	Sundberg		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
817.001	Ms.	Amy	Douglas		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
817.003	Ms.	Amy	Douglas		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
817.022	Ms.	Amy	Douglas		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
818.001	Ms.	Kathleen	Andrews		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
818.002	Ms.	Kathleen	Andrews		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
818.003	Ms.	Kathleen	Andrews		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
819.001	Ms.	Donna	Roxey		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
819.002	Ms.	Donna	Roxey		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
819.003	Ms.	Donna	Roxey		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
820.001	Ms.	Landra	White		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
820.002	Ms.	Landra	White		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
820.003	Ms.	Landra	White		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
821.001	Mr.	Daingerfield	Ashton		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
821.002	Mr.	Daingerfield	Ashton		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
821.003	Mr.	Daingerfield	Ashton		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
822.001	Mr.	David	Rigsby		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
822.002	Mr.	David	Rigsby		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
822.003	Mr.	David	Rigsby		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
823.001	Ms.	Louise	Desmarais		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
823.002	Ms.	Louise	Desmarais		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
823.003	Ms.	Louise	Desmarais		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
824.001	Mr.	Teresa	Winchster		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
824.002	Mr.	Teresa	Winchster		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
824.003	Mr.	Teresa	Winchster		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
825.001		Lynn	Faulkner		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
825.002		Lynn	Faulkner		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
825.003		Lynn	Faulkner		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
826.001	Ms.	Donna	Parker		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
826.002	Ms.	Donna	Parker		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
826.003	Ms.	Donna	Parker		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
827.001	Mr.	Karl	Maness		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
827.002	Mr.	Karl	Maness		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
827.003	Mr.	Karl	Maness		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
828.001	Ms.	Ruth	Bagley		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
828.002	Ms.	Ruth	Bagley		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
828.003	Ms.	Ruth	Bagley		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
829.001	Ms.	Jo-Ann	Mapson		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
829.002	Ms.	Jo-Ann	Mapson		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
829.003	Ms.	Jo-Ann	Mapson		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
830.001	Ms.	Laura	Merrill		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
830.002	Ms.	Laura	Merrill		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
830.003	Ms.	Laura	Merrill		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
831.001		Fran	Hardy		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
831.002		Fran	Hardy		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
831.003		Fran	Hardy		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
832.001	Ms.	Lura	Brookins		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
832.002	Ms.	Lura	Brookins		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
832.003	Ms.	Lura	Brookins		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
833.001	Ms.	Sandra	Halpin		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
833.002	Ms.	Sandra	Halpin		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
833.003	Ms.	Sandra	Halpin		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
834.001	Ms.	Belle	Hollon		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
834.002	Ms.	Belle	Hollon		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
834.003	Ms.	Belle	Hollon		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
835.001	Ms.	Sandra	Mann		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
835.002	Ms.	Sandra	Mann		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
835.003	Ms.	Sandra	Mann		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
836.001	Mr.	Charles	Carruthers		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
836.002	Mr.	Charles	Carruthers		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
836.003	Mr.	Charles	Carruthers		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
837.001	Mr.	Ralph	Lopez		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
837.002	Mr.	Ralph	Lopez		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
837.003	Mr.	Ralph	Lopez		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
838.001	Mr.	Bradey	Stevens		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
838.002	Mr.	Bradey	Stevens		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
838.003	Mr.	Bradey	Stevens		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
839.001	Ms.	Martha	Novak		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
839.002	Ms.	Martha	Novak		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
839.003	Ms.	Martha	Novak		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
840.001	Mr.	Andrew	Cummings		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
840.002	Mr.	Andrew	Cummings		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
840.003	Mr.	Andrew	Cummings		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
841.001	Mr.	Dallas	Rychener		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
841.002	Mr.	Dallas	Rychener		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
841.003	Mr.	Dallas	Rychener		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
842.001	Ms.	Mona	Sarrai		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
842.002	Ms.	Mona	Sarrai		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
842.003	Ms.	Mona	Sarrai		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
843.001		Sydney	Walter		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
843.002		Sydney	Walter		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
843.003		Sydney	Walter		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
844.001	Ms.	Laura	Williamson		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
844.002	Ms.	Laura	Williamson		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
844.003	Ms.	Laura	Williamson		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
845.001	Mr.	Crawford	Best		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
845.002	Mr.	Crawford	Best		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
845.003	Mr.	Crawford	Best		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
846.001	Mr.	J. Paul	Lanier		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
846.002	Mr.	J. Paul	Lanier		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
846.003	Mr.	J. Paul	Lanier		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
847.001	Ms.	Wendy	Dolci		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
847.002	Ms.	Wendy	Dolci		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
847.003	Ms.	Wendy	Dolci		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
848.001	Ms.	Eileen	Stevens		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
848.002	Ms.	Eileen	Stevens		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
848.003	Ms.	Eileen	Stevens		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
849.001	Mrs. & Mr.	Ruby and Ray	Munholland		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
849.002	Mrs. & Mr.	Ruby and Ray	Munholland		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
849.003	Mrs. & Mr.	Ruby and Ray	Munholland		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
850.001	Mr.	Barry	Williams		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
850.002	Mr.	Barry	Williams		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
850.003	Mr.	Barry	Williams		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
851.001	Ms.	Carol	Vigil		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
851.002	Ms.	Carol	Vigil		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
851.003	Ms.	Carol	Vigil		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
852.001	Ms.	Bonnie	Poloner		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
852.002	Ms.	Bonnie	Poloner		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
852.003	Ms.	Bonnie	Poloner		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
853.001	Ms.	Holly	Brady		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
853.002	Ms.	Holly	Brady		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
853.003	Ms.	Holly	Brady		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
854.001	Ms.	Rita	Snyder		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
854.002	Ms.	Rita	Snyder		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
854.003	Ms.	Rita	Snyder		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
855.001	Ms.	Emily	Rothman		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
855.002	Ms.	Emily	Rothman		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
855.003	Ms.	Emily	Rothman		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
856.001	Ms.	Stephanie	Nemet		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
856.002	Ms.	Stephanie	Nemet		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
856.003	Ms.	Stephanie	Nemet		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
857.001	Ms.	Carolyn	Mountain		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
857.002	Ms.	Carolyn	Mountain		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
857.003	Ms.	Carolyn	Mountain		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
858.001	Ms.	Carol	Hawkins		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
858.002	Ms.	Carol	Hawkins		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
858.003	Ms.	Carol	Hawkins		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
859.001	Ms.	Margaret	King		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
859.002	Ms.	Margaret	King		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
859.003	Ms.	Margaret	King		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
860.001	Mr.	Thomas	Alvarado		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
860.002	Mr.	Thomas	Alvarado		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
860.003	Mr.	Thomas	Alvarado		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
861.001		Marllin	McKenna		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
861.002		Marllin	McKenna		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
861.003		Marllin	McKenna		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
862.001	Ms.	Londa	Fowler		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
862.002	Ms.	Londa	Fowler		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
862.003	Ms.	Londa	Fowler		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
863.001	Ms.	Patricia	Mann		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
863.002	Ms.	Patricia	Mann		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
863.003	Ms.	Patricia	Mann		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
864.001	Mr.	Brandon	Smith		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
864.002	Mr.	Brandon	Smith		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
864.003	Mr.	Brandon	Smith			The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
865.001	Ms.	Barbara	Gage		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
865.002	Ms.	Barbara	Gage		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
865.003	Ms.	Barbara	Gage		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
866.001	Mr.	Tom	Debrayanna		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
866.002	Mr.	Tom	Debrayanna		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
866.003	Mr.	Tom	Debrayanna		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
867.001	Ms.	Margaret	Loyd		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
867.002	Ms.	Margaret	Loyd		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
867.003	Ms.	Margaret	Loyd		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
868.001	Mr.	William	Mader		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
868.002	Mr.	William	Mader		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
868.003	Mr.	William	Mader		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
869.001	Mr.	Robert	Manna		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
869.002	Mr.	Robert	Manna		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
869.003	Mr.	Robert	Manna		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
870.001	Ms.	Judi	Svihla		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
870.002	Ms.	Judi	Svihla		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
870.003	Ms.	Judi	Svihla		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
871.001	Ms.	Molly	Mysliwec		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
871.002	Ms.	Molly	Mysliwec		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
871.003	Ms.	Molly	Mysliwec		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
872.001	Mr.	Karl	Lehmann		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
872.002	Mr.	Karl	Lehmann		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
872.003	Mr.	Karl	Lehmann		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
873.001		Swaran Kaur	Khalsa		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
873.002		Swaran Kaur	Khalsa		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
873.003		Swaran Kaur	Khalsa		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
874.001	Ms.	Carol	Walters		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
874.002	Ms.	Carol	Walters		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
874.003	Ms.	Carol	Walters		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
875.001	Ms.	Deanna	Crask-Stone		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
875.002	Ms.	Deanna	Crask-Stone		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
875.003	Ms.	Deanna	Crask-Stone		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
876.001	Ms.	Dara	Beckley		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
876.002	Ms.	Dara	Beckley		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
876.003	Ms.	Dara	Beckley		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
877.001	Ms.	Jessica	Duke		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
877.002	Ms.	Jessica	Duke		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
877.003	Ms.	Jessica	Duke		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
878.001	Ms.	Karen	Birner		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
878.002	Ms.	Karen	Birner		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
878.003	Ms.	Karen	Birner		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
879.001	Ms.	Erika	Wanenmacher		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
879.002	Ms.	Erika	Wanenmacher		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
879.003	Ms.	Erika	Wanenmacher		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
880.001	Mr.	Jack	Clark		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
880.002	Mr.	Jack	Clark		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
880.003	Mr.	Jack	Clark		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
881.001	Mr.	Charles	Doughty		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
881.002	Mr.	Charles	Doughty		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
881.003	Mr.	Charles	Doughty		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
882.001	Mr.	Andrew	Gold		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
882.002	Mr.	Andrew	Gold		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
882.003	Mr.	Andrew	Gold		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
883.001	Ms.	Sarah	Brownrigg		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
883.002	Ms.	Sarah	Brownrigg		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
883.003	Ms.	Sarah	Brownrigg		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
884.001	Ms.	Patti	Havens		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
884.002	Ms.	Patti	Havens		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
884.003	Ms.	Patti	Havens		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
885.001	Ms.	Cassandra	Suarez		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
885.002	Ms.	Cassandra	Suarez		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
885.003	Ms.	Cassandra	Suarez		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
886.001	Ms.	Kryzstyna	Peyton-Noland		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
886.002	Ms.	Kryzstyna	Peyton-Noland		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
886.003	Ms.	Kryzstyna	Peyton-Noland		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
887.001		I.	Engle		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
887.002		I.	Engle		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
887.003		I.	Engle		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
888.001	Mr.	Doug	Mattson		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
888.002	Mr.	Doug	Mattson		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
888.003	Mr.	Doug	Mattson		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
889.001	Mr.	David	Gunzel		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
889.002	Mr.	David	Gunzel		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
889.003	Mr.	David	Gunzel		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
890.001		Jackie	Cronin		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
890.002		Jackie	Cronin		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
890.003		Jackie	Cronin		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
891.001	Ms.	Wendy	Adler		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
891.002	Ms.	Wendy	Adler		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
891.003	Ms.	Wendy	Adler		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
892.001	Ms.	Joan	O'Donnell		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
892.002	Ms.	Joan	O'Donnell		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
892.003	Ms.	Joan	O'Donnell		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
893.001	Mr.	Thomas	Wark		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
893.002	Mr.	Thomas	Wark		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
893.003	Mr.	Thomas	Wark		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
894.001	Mr.	Steve	Frost		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
894.002	Mr.	Steve	Frost		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
894.003	Mr.	Steve	Frost		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
895.001	Mr.	David	Markham		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
895.002	Mr.	David	Markham		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
895.003	Mr.	David	Markham		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
896.001	Ms.	Sandra	Garrick		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
896.002	Ms.	Sandra	Garrick		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
896.003	Ms.	Sandra	Garrick		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
897.001	Ms.	Joanna	Harmon		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
897.002	Ms.	Joanna	Harmon		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
897.003	Ms.	Joanna	Harmon		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
898.001		Michel	Wingard		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
898.002		Michel	Wingard		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
898.003		Michel	Wingard		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
899.001	Mr.	Don	Blackburn		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
899.002	Mr.	Don	Blackburn		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
899.003	Mr.	Don	Blackburn		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
900.001	Ms.	Irene	Fertik		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
900.002	Ms.	Irene	Fertik		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
900.003	Ms.	Irene	Fertik		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
901.001	Ms.	Cheryl	Nelsen		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
901.002	Ms.	Cheryl	Nelsen		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
901.003	Ms.	Cheryl	Nelsen		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
902.001	Mr.	Mike	Krehbiel		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
902.002	Mr.	Mike	Krehbiel		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
902.003	Mr.	Mike	Krehbiel		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
903.001	Mrs. & Mr.	Bonnie & Don	Long		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
903.002	Mrs. & Mr.	Bonnie & Don	Long		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
903.003	Mrs. & Mr.	Bonnie & Don	Long		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
904.001	Mr.	Tom	Videen		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
904.002	Mr.	Tom	Videen		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
904.003	Mr.	Tom	Videen		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
905.001	Mr.	Glenn	Yocum		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
905.002	Mr.	Glenn	Yocum		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
905.003	Mr.	Glenn	Yocum		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
906.001	Ms.	Mary	Cottrill		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
906.002	Ms.	Mary	Cottrill		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
906.003	Ms.	Mary	Cottrill		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
907.001	Ms.	Charlene	Reader		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
907.002	Ms.	Charlene	Reader		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
907.003	Ms.	Charlene	Reader		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
908.001	Ms.	Jo Ann	Hakola		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
908.002	Ms.	Jo Ann	Hakola		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
908.003	Ms.	Jo Ann	Hakola		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
909.001	Ms.	Vicki	Mitchell		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
909.002	Ms.	Vicki	Mitchell		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
909.003	Ms.	Vicki	Mitchell		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
910.001	Mr.	Don	Blackburn		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
910.002	Mr.	Don	Blackburn		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
910.003	Mr.	Don	Blackburn		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
911.001	Mr.	Russell	Brito		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
911.002	Mr.	Russell	Brito		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
911.003	Mr.	Russell	Brito		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
912.001	Mr.	Roger	Squires		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
912.002	Mr.	Roger	Squires		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
912.003	Mr.	Roger	Squires		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
913.001	Ms.	Patricia	Grossman		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
913.002	Ms.	Patricia	Grossman		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
913.003	Ms.	Patricia	Grossman		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
914.001	Ms.	Karen	Blockland		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
914.002	Ms.	Karen	Blockland		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
914.003	Ms.	Karen	Blockland		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
915.001	Mr.	Willam	Buss		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
915.002	Mr.	Willam	Buss		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
915.003	Mr.	Willam	Buss		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
916.001	Ms.	Elizabeth	Buchen		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
916.002	Ms.	Elizabeth	Buchen		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
916.003	Ms.	Elizabeth	Buchen		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
917.001	Ms.	Glenda	Murphy		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
917.002	Ms.	Glenda	Murphy		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
917.003	Ms.	Glenda	Murphy		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
918.001		Arifa	Goodman		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
918.002		Arifa	Goodman		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
918.003		Arifa	Goodman		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
919.001	Mr.	Howard	Feder		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
919.002	Mr.	Howard	Feder		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
919.003	Mr.	Howard	Feder		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
920.001	Mr.	Adam	Velasquez		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
920.002	Mr.	Adam	Velasquez		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
920.003	Mr.	Adam	Velasquez		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
921.001	Ms.	Amy	Atkins		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
921.002	Ms.	Amy	Atkins		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
921.003	Ms.	Amy	Atkins		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
922.001	Mr.	John	Brown		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
922.002	Mr.	John	Brown		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
922.003	Mr.	John	Brown		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
923.001	Mr.	David	Calvert		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
923.002	Mr.	David	Calvert		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
923.003	Mr.	David	Calvert		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
924.001	Mr.	Ross	Lockridge		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
924.002	Mr.	Ross	Lockridge		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
924.003	Mr.	Ross	Lockridge		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
925.001	Mr.	Robert	Christie		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
925.002	Mr.	Robert	Christie		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
925.003	Mr.	Robert	Christie		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
926.001	Ms.	Mary	Will		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
926.002	Ms.	Mary	Will		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
926.003	Ms.	Mary	Will		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
927.001	Ms.	Valentine	Mckay		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
927.002	Ms.	Valentine	Mckay		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
927.003	Ms.	Valentine	Mckay		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
928.001	Ms.	Millie	Ridenour		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
928.002	Ms.	Millie	Ridenour		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
928.003	Ms.	Millie	Ridenour		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
929.001	Ms.	Lorraine	Gilmore		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
929.002	Ms.	Lorraine	Gilmore		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
929.003	Ms.	Lorraine	Gilmore		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
930.001	Mr.	John	Chadwick		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
930.002	Mr.	John	Chadwick		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
930.003	Mr.	John	Chadwick		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
931.001	Mr.	Jeffrey	Colledge		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
931.002	Mr.	Jeffrey	Colledge		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
931.003	Mr.	Jeffrey	Colledge		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
932.001	Mr.	Steve	Nuanez		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
932.002	Mr.	Steve	Nuanez		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
932.003	Mr.	Steve	Nuanez		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
933.001	Ms.	Mary	Deforest		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
933.002	Ms.	Mary	Deforest		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
933.003	Ms.	Mary	Deforest		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
934.001	Ms.	Diana	Gonzales-Pacheco		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
934.002	Ms.	Diana	Gonzales-Pacheco		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
934.003	Ms.	Diana	Gonzales-Pacheco		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
935.001	Ms.	Moira	O'Hanlon		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
935.002	Ms.	Moira	O'Hanlon		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
935.003	Ms.	Moira	O'Hanlon		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
936.001	Mr.	Chilton	Gregory		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
936.002	Mr.	Chilton	Gregory		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
936.003	Mr.	Chilton	Gregory		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
937.001	Ms.	Phyllis	Becerra		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
937.002	Ms.	Phyllis	Becerra		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
937.003	Ms.	Phyllis	Becerra		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
938.001	Ms.	Judith	Lewis		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
938.002	Ms.	Judith	Lewis		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
938.003	Ms.	Judith	Lewis		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
939.001	Ms.	Ana	O'Brien		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
939.002	Ms.	Ana	O'Brien		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
939.003	Ms.	Ana	O'Brien		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
940.001	Ms.	Victoria	Regina		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
940.002	Ms.	Victoria	Regina		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
940.003	Ms.	Victoria	Regina		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
941.001	Ms.	Juliet	Calabi		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
941.002	Ms.	Juliet	Calabi		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
941.003	Ms.	Juliet	Calabi		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
942.001	Ms.	Rodema	Ashby		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
942.002	Ms.	Rodema	Ashby		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
942.003	Ms.	Rodema	Ashby		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
943.001	Mr.	Ken	Martin		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
943.002	Mr.	Ken	Martin		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
943.003	Mr.	Ken	Martin		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
944.001	Ms.	Vicki	Altenberg		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
944.002	Ms.	Vicki	Altenberg		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
944.003	Ms.	Vicki	Altenberg		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
945.001	Mr.	Robert	Wofford		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
945.002	Mr.	Robert	Wofford		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
945.003	Mr.	Robert	Wofford		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
946.001	Mr.	Ralph	Heyman		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
946.002	Mr.	Ralph	Heyman		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
946.003	Mr.	Ralph	Heyman		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
947.001	Ms.	Adrienne	Ross		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
947.002	Ms.	Adrienne	Ross		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
947.003	Ms.	Adrienne	Ross		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
948.001		Robin	Rupe		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
948.002		Robin	Rupe		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
948.003		Robin	Rupe		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
949.001	Mr.	Dick	Altrock		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
949.002	Mr.	Dick	Altrock		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
949.003	Mr.	Dick	Altrock		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
950.001		J.	Corcoran		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
950.002		J.	Corcoran		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
950.003		J.	Corcoran		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
951.001	Ms.	Nancy	Fischer		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
951.002	Ms.	Nancy	Fischer		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
951.003	Ms.	Nancy	Fischer		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
952.001	Ms.	Anna	Baltz		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
952.002	Ms.	Anna	Baltz		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
952.003	Ms.	Anna	Baltz		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
953.001	Ms.	Sarah	Savala		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
953.002	Ms.	Sarah	Savala		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
953.003	Ms.	Sarah	Savala		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
954.001	Ms.	Jane	Abbott		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
954.002	Ms.	Jane	Abbott		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
954.003	Ms.	Jane	Abbott		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
955.001	Mr.	Arnold	Woods		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
955.002	Mr.	Arnold	Woods		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
955.003	Mr.	Arnold	Woods		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
956.001	Ms.	Joani	Murphy		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
956.002	Ms.	Joani	Murphy		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
956.003	Ms.	Joani	Murphy		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
957.001	Ms.	Linda	Frazer		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
957.002	Ms.	Linda	Frazer		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
957.003	Ms.	Linda	Frazer		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
958.001	Ms.	Elizabeth	Blumenstock		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
958.002	Ms.	Elizabeth	Blumenstock		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
958.003	Ms.	Elizabeth	Blumenstock		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
959.001	Mr.	Mike	Anderson		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
959.002	Mr.	Mike	Anderson		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
959.003	Mr.	Mike	Anderson		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
960.001	Mr.	John	Kitzinger		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
960.002	Mr.	John	Kitzinger		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
960.003	Mr.	John	Kitzinger		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
961.001	Ms.	Bette	Johnson		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
961.002	Ms.	Bette	Johnson		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
961.003	Ms.	Bette	Johnson		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
962.001	Ms.	Judith	Alcala		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
962.002	Ms.	Judith	Alcala		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
962.003	Ms.	Judith	Alcala		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
963.001	Ms.	Linda	Renner		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
963.002	Ms.	Linda	Renner		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
963.003	Ms.	Linda	Renner		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
964.001	Mr.	Joseph	Shoemaker		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
964.002	Mr.	Joseph	Shoemaker		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
964.003	Mr.	Joseph	Shoemaker		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
965.001	Mr.	Heath	Dickns		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
965.002	Mr.	Heath	Dickns		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
965.003	Mr.	Heath	Dickns		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
966.001	Mr.	Paul	Lanoie		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
966.002	Mr.	Paul	Lanoie		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
966.003	Mr.	Paul	Lanoie		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
967.001	Mr. & Mrs.	Walter & Isolde	Wait		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
967.002	Mr. & Mrs.	Walter & Isolde	Wait		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
967.003	Mr. & Mrs.	Walter & Isolde	Wait		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
968.001		M.	Holzwarth		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
968.002		M.	Holzwarth		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
968.003		M.	Holzwarth		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
969.001	Ms.	Linda	Wanner		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
969.002	Ms.	Linda	Wanner		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
969.003	Ms.	Linda	Wanner		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
970.001	Ms.	Anne	Petrokubi		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
970.002	Ms.	Anne	Petrokubi		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
970.003	Ms.	Anne	Petrokubi		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
971.001	Mr.	Michael	Westbay		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
971.002	Mr.	Michael	Westbay		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
971.003	Mr.	Michael	Westbay		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
972.001	Ms.	Nancy	King		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
972.002	Ms.	Nancy	King		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
972.003	Ms.	Nancy	King		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
973.001	Ms.	Annette	Roberge		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
973.002	Ms.	Annette	Roberge		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
973.003	Ms.	Annette	Roberge		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
974.001		Terry	Warkentine		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
974.002		Terry	Warkentine		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
974.003		Terry	Warkentine		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
975.001	Mr.	Mario	Rivera		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
975.002	Mr.	Mario	Rivera		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
975.003	Mr.	Mario	Rivera		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
976.001	Ms.	Saundra	Fox		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
976.002	Ms.	Saundra	Fox		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
976.003	Ms.	Saundra	Fox		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
977.001	Mr.	Joel	Goldblatt		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
977.002	Mr.	Joel	Goldblatt		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
977.003	Mr.	Joel	Goldblatt		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
978.001	Mr.	Joel	Goldblatt		6/27/2014	Wind down the plant and add solar and wind there!!	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives
978.002	Mr.	Joel	Goldblatt		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
978.003	Mr.	Joel	Goldblatt		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives.
978.004	Mr.	Joel	Goldblatt		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
979.001	Ms.	Erika	Gerety		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
979.002	Ms.	Erika	Gerety		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
979.003	Ms.	Erika	Gerety		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
980.001	Ms.	Martha	Archuleta		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
980.002	Ms.	Martha	Archuleta		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
980.003	Ms.	Martha	Archuleta		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
981.001	Mr.	Don	Zeigler		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
981.002	Mr.	Don	Zeigler		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
981.003	Mr.	Don	Zeigler		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
982.001	Mr.	Gary	Holcomb		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
982.002	Mr.	Gary	Holcomb		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
982.003	Mr.	Gary	Holcomb		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
983.001	Ms.	Lucy	Sommer		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
983.002	Ms.	Lucy	Sommer		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
983.003	Ms.	Lucy	Sommer		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
984.001	Ms.	Susan	Clegg		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
984.002	Ms.	Susan	Clegg		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
984.003	Ms.	Susan	Clegg		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
985.001	Ms.	Jennifer	Myers		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
985.002	Ms.	Jennifer	Myers		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
985.003	Ms.	Jennifer	Myers		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
986.001	Mr.	Ken	Hughes		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
986.002	Mr.	Ken	Hughes		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
986.003	Mr.	Ken	Hughes		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
987.001	Ms.	Donna	Calles		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
987.002	Ms.	Donna	Calles		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
987.003	Ms.	Donna	Calles		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
988.001	Mr.	Berton	Stevens		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
988.002	Mr.	Berton	Stevens		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
988.003	Mr.	Berton	Stevens		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
989.001	Mr.	Curtis	Rigdon		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
989.002	Mr.	Curtis	Rigdon		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
989.003	Mr.	Curtis	Rigdon		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
990.001	Mr.	Gary	Cronin		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
990.002	Mr.	Gary	Cronin		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
990.003	Mr.	Gary	Cronin		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
991.001		T.	Truske		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
991.002		T.	Truske		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
991.003		T.	Truske		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
992.001	Ms.	Annalisa	Cutler		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
992.002	Ms.	Annalisa	Cutler		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
992.003	Ms.	Annalisa	Cutler		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
993.001	Mr.	Samuel	Lee		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
993.002	Mr.	Samuel	Lee		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
993.003	Mr.	Samuel	Lee		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
994.001	Ms.	Judith	Mccarthy		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
994.002	Ms.	Judith	Mccarthy		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
994.003	Ms.	Judith	Mccarthy		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
995.001	Ms.	Kathi	L'Belle		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
995.002	Ms.	Kathi	L'Belle		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
995.003	Ms.	Kathi	L'Belle		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
996.001	Ms.	Martha	Ennis		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
996.002	Ms.	Martha	Ennis		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
996.003	Ms.	Martha	Ennis		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
997.001	Mr.	Ivan	Pfeifer		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
997.002	Mr.	Ivan	Pfeifer		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
997.003	Mr.	Ivan	Pfeifer		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
998.001	Ms.	Martha	Archuleta		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
998.002	Ms.	Martha	Archuleta		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
998.003	Ms.	Martha	Archuleta		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
999.001	Ms.	Faith	Harmony		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
999.002	Ms.	Faith	Harmony		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
999.003	Ms.	Faith	Harmony		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
1000.001	Mr.	Mark	Jones		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1000.001	Mr.	Mark	Jones		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1000.001	Mr.	Mark	Jones		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
1001.001	Ms.	Anita	Hernandez		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1001.002	Ms.	Anita	Hernandez		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
1001.003	Ms.	Anita	Hernandez		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
1002.001		Lynn	Eubank		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1002.002		Lynn	Eubank		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
1002.003		Lynn	Eubank		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
1003.001	Ms.	Merry	Harsh		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1003.002	Ms.	Merry	Harsh		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
1003.003	Ms.	Merry	Harsh		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
1004.001	Mr.	Ivan	Blockland		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1004.002	Mr.	Ivan	Blockland		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
1004.003	Mr.	Ivan	Blockland		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
1005.001	Ms.	Pamela	Timmerman		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1005.002	Ms.	Pamela	Timmerman		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
1005.003	Ms.	Pamela	Timmerman		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1006.001	Mr.	David	Morehead		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1006.002	Mr.	David	Morehead		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
1006.003	Mr.	David	Morehead		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
1007.001	Ms.	Nicole	Harings		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1007.002	Ms.	Nicole	Harings		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
1007.003	Ms.	Nicole	Harings		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
1008.001	Ms.	Martha	Arreguin		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1008.002	Ms.	Martha	Arreguin		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1008.003	Ms.	Martha	Arreguin		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
1009.001	Ms.	Jacqueline	Jones		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1009.002	Ms.	Jacqueline	Jones		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
1009.003	Ms.	Jacqueline	Jones		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
1010.001	Ms.	Dianne	Carrell		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1010.002	Ms.	Dianne	Carrell		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
1010.003	Ms.	Dianne	Carrell		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
1011.001	Ms.	Diane	Bloom		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1011.002	Ms.	Diane	Bloom		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
1011.003	Ms.	Diane	Bloom		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
1012.001	Mr.	Curtis	Rigdon			However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1012.002	Mr.	Curtis	Rigdon			I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
1012.003	Mr.	Curtis	Rigdon			The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
1013.001	Ms.	Antoinette	Bebonang		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1013.002	Ms.	Antoinette	Bebonang		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
1013.003	Ms.	Antoinette	Bebonang		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1014.001		Wick	Beavers		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1014.002		Wick	Beavers		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
1014.003		Wick	Beavers		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
1015.001	Ms.	Kathy	Arneberg		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1015.002	Ms.	Kathy	Arneberg		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
1015.003	Ms.	Kathy	Arneberg		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
1016.001	Mr.	Michael F	Rhoderick		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1016.002	Mr.	Michael F	Rhoderick		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1016.003	Mr.	Michael F	Rhoderick		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
1017.001	Mr.	Robert	Mcfarland		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1017.002	Mr.	Robert	Mcfarland		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
1017.003	Mr.	Robert	Mcfarland		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
1018.001	Mr.	Terence	Gurley		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1018.002	Mr.	Terence	Gurley		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
1018.003	Mr.	Terence	Gurley		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
1019.001	Mr.	Daniel	Galindro		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1019.002	Mr.	Daniel	Galindro		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
1019.003	Mr.	Daniel	Galindro		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
1020.001	Mr.	Barry	hatfield		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1020.002	Mr.	Barry	hatfield		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
1020.003	Mr.	Barry	hatfield		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
1021.001	Ms.	Jayne	Schell		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1021.002	Ms.	Jayne	Schell		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
1021.003	Ms.	Jayne	Schell		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1022.001	Ms.	Dorothy	Woodward		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1022.002	Ms.	Dorothy	Woodward		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
1022.003	Ms.	Dorothy	Woodward		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
1023.001		Syabil	Werth		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1023.002		Syabil	Werth		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
1023.003		Syabil	Werth		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
1024.001	Ms.	Mercia	Lee		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1024.002	Ms.	Mercia	Lee		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1024.003	Ms.	Mercia	Lee		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
1025.001	Ms.	Willow	Murphy		6/29/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1025.002	Ms.	Willow	Murphy		6/29/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
1026.001	Ms.	Beth	Enson		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
1026.002	Ms.	Beth	Enson		6/28/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
1027.001	Ms.	Mary	Ownby		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
1028.001	Ms.	Ellen	Robinson		6/28/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
1029.001	Mr.	Adam	Hill		6/27/2014	Please consider placing government owned solar panels in the median of the major interstates in the Southwest. Ample power could be generated to displace the need for the air polluting coal plants at a reasonable rate using land that has already been developed and already has road access and in most cases easy access to existing transmission lines.	Please see Master Response #2. Renewable Energy Alternatives

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1030.001	Mr.	Thomas	Gump			No substantive comment	Thank you for your comment.
1031.001	Ms.	Rebecca	Walding		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
1032.001		Louise	Benally		6/26/2014	No substantive comment	Thank you for your comment.
1033.001	Ms.	Karen	James		6/27/2014	After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment. Only when the impacts and costs of the plant are properly spelled out and appropriate alternatives are considered will OSM have a rational basis for making any decision regarding the mine and plant.	Please see Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS and Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1034.001	Ms.	Judy	Mellow		6/27/2014	The United States should be on the cutting edge of clean technology; coal is SO 17th century.	Thank you for your comment. Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives
1035.001	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley	Dine CARE	6/27/2014	Attached are 695 petition signatures urging the Office of Surface Mining (OSM) to include a health impact and water impact study in the Final EIS.	Thank you for your comment. Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS addresses health and safety. Specifically, pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarize the results of the human health risk assessment conducted for the project. Section 4.5 of the Draft EIS addresses potential impacts to water resources. In addition, please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis.
1035.002	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley	Dine CARE	6/27/2014	As of June 27, 2014, there has been no response to the letters and resolutions sent from communities and Tribal officials on concerns that could cause irreparable harm to the Dine people. We are urging OSM to file this under the Environmental Justice section. Below is a view of the petition: We, the undersigned concerned community members request for the Navajo Nation Council to rescind Legislation 0149-13, which includes the waiver of BHP Billiton's past, present, and future liabilities (health, environmental, financial, legal, etc.) from the Navajo Mine. The Navajo People were not properly informed prior to the Legislation being passed, and did not receive appropriate time or information to voice their concerns. The Navajo People need governmental transparency on all governmental levels (Navajo Nation, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and Department of the Interior) and increased public input. Therefore, we request information on the proposed acquisition of BHP Billiton Navajo Mine at all 10 Chapters on the Navajo Nation.	The Environmental Justice analysis considers the entire Navajo membership as an environmentally justice population, and does not take into account any division between project supporters and objectors. Further, it is beyond the scope of this EIS to comment on legislation passed by the Navajo Nation Tribal Council. The role of an EIS is to analyze potential effects, including environmental justice, of a proposed action and alternatives to that action, but not to determine if the proposed action itself is wanted/rejected by certain parties.
1035.003	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley	Dine CARE	6/27/2014	Also attached are resolutions passed by three Chapters, the Dine Medicine Men Association (DMMA), and the District 9 Grazing Committee requesting for a 60-day extension on the DEIS comment period and requesting for the entire DEIS to be translated in the Navajo language and requesting involvement from the Navajo Nation's Environmental Protection Agency.	Please see Master Response #8, Public Review Period and Master Response #10, Translation of the EIS.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1036.001	Mr.	Keith	Morris		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1036.002	Mr.	Keith	Morris		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
1036.003	Mr.	Keith	Morris		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
1037.001	Mr.	Joe	Puleo		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1037.002	Mr.	Joe	Puleo		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
1037.003	Mr.	Joe	Puleo		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
1038.001	Mr.	Bob	Tweten		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1038.002	Mr.	Bob	Tweten		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1038.003	Mr.	Bob	Tweten		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
1039.001	Ms.	Ann	Roylance		6/27/2014	However, your agency's Environmental Impact Statement does not adequately address the power plant and mine's major negative impacts on our climate and on health in the Four Corners region.	Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1039.002	Ms.	Ann	Roylance		6/27/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to require the consideration of additional alternatives, including alternatives for transition away from continued operation of Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant. After OSM has made these corrections, the Environmental Impact Statement should be reissued for public comment.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives and Master Response #6, Reissuance of the Draft EIS
1039.003	Ms.	Ann	Roylance		6/27/2014	The closure of the oldest three units and planned improvements to its two biggest units would still leave 80 percent of the Four Corners Power Plant pumping carbon and other pollutants far into the future,	Thank you for your comment. A summary of the reduction in emissions as a result of the Federal Implementation Plan is provided in Table 4.1-28 of the Draft EIS. For clarification, shut-down of Units 1, 2, 3 reduced the overall electrical generation capacity of the FCPP by approximately 30%. The Federal Implementation Plan is considered as part of the baseline environmental setting in the EIS.
1040.001	Ms.	Earlene	Reid		6/26/14	Health Study is needed.	Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS addresses health and safety; specifically, pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarize the results of the human health risk assessment conducted for the project. In addition, public health is addressed in the air quality analysis (Section 4.1), as well as project-specific analyses of health effects of diesel particulate matter and fugitive dust. The EIS also summarizes local health studies conducted by New Mexico Environment Department.
1041.001	Ms.	Roselyn	Begay		6/26/14	They need to look into "Renewable Energy" - (solar, etc.)	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives
1042.001	Mr.	Bill	McKinley		6/26/14	We need a health study.	Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS addresses health and safety; specifically, pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarize the results of the human health risk assessment conducted for the project. In addition, public health is addressed in the air quality analysis (Section 4.1), as well as project-specific analyses of health effects of diesel particulate matter and fugitive dust. The EIS also summarizes local health studies conducted by New Mexico Environment Department.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1043.001	Mr.	Joseph	Gollaher		6/26/14	Its time a health and environmental study is done.	Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS addresses health and safety; specifically, pages 4.17-22 through 4/17-24 summarize the results of the human health risk assessment conducted for the project. In addition, public health is addressed in the air quality analysis (Section 4.2), as well as project-specific analyses of health effects of diesel particulate matter and fugitive dust. The EIS also summarizes local health studies conducted by New Mexico Environment Department.
1044.001	Mr.	Joe	Allen		6/27/14	Think Renewable Energe and shut this Navajo mine F.C.P.P. down.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives
1045.001	Mr.	Joe	Allen		6/27/14	Renewable Energy!	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives
1046.001	Ms.	Victoria	Gutierrez		6/27/14	The EIS process was a sham! No real public participation! The open house set up was the worst way to have a transparent community meeting. Navajo way is open the microphone, so people can talk openly and others can hear.	Please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format
1047.001	Mr.	RB	Hunt		6/26/14	On the persepective of a beekeeper the chemicals coming out of the Power Plant and the damage to native plant species is detrimental to the honeybee. There are many toxic chemicals coming out of coal waste and exhaust from the Power Plants. The coal ash is very similar to the pollens that are a protein source for the honeybee, and the honeybees cannot tell the difference until it is too late.	The EIS evaluated the ecotoxicological effects of the discharge from the plant and found them to be minor. There is a cumulative effect, related to the high levels of some metals in soils, as described in the cumulative impact section of the EIS.
1048.001	Ms.	Ora	Begay		6/26/14	We need a real meeting, a real hearing, and not the poster comment. This is not our way to get the job done.	Please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format
1049.001	Mr.	Joe	Allen		6/27/14	Clean Energy is the future. Renewable Energy.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives
1050.001	Mr.	Joe	Allen		6/27/14	They need to redo the EIS public meetings. And need to do them on a weekend. Accommodate people that work Mon-Friday. Then have to travel home. These meetings the EIS had were not done right. No public participation was given. And the people felt scared to talk thats what people said. Hold open mic so people wont be so afraid to speak.... And why were people being followed and harrassed by OSM staff during these EIS hearings.	Please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format
1051.001	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley		6/27/14	The DEIS claims renewable energy such as solare and wind will not be economically feasible, yet APS still has to pay an estimated \$350 million to install SCR's on untis 4 and 5 by 2018. Wouldn't it be more economically feasible to transition units 1,2,3 of FCPP to renewable energy? In addition, transitioning to solar/wind could provide hundreds to thousands of direct and indirect jobs to the Navajo Nationa and minimize air pollution and therefore minimize health impacts on the people, water, land, and animals.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1052.001	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley		6/27/14	The DEIS claims “minor impacts” to water resources including Chaco Wash, San Juan River, and groundwater, yet the DEIS did not claim how much more water will be pumped from the San Juan river to cool down the FCPP for an additional 25 years.	As stated on page 4.5-59, Surface water drawn from the San Juan River into Morgan Lake for use at the FCPP is obtained according to water rights held by BBNMC. The final disposition of the water rights is still pending and will be resolved between BNCC and NTEC. No changes to the water use would occur under the Proposed Action and NTEC (and the FCPP) would maintain the ability to draw as much water as the rights allow for the Project life. Given the current water right appropriations, water drawn from the San Juan River would continue as stated in the agreement.
1052.002	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley		6/27/14	In addition, the DEIS claims there are ongoing monitoring wells next to the plant/mine operations, but do these monitoring wells/stations capture the possible leaching and possible contamination of coal ash on the nearby waterways? Who monitors this activity and how can a community member obtain this data?	Analysis of groundwater monitoring data at the FCPP is described on page 4.5-57 of the Draft EIS. Monitoring is conducted voluntarily by APS. Groundwater monitoring records used in the preparation of the Draft EIS are available as part of the administrative record for this NEPA process.
1053.001	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley		6/27/14	What will it cost the Navajo Nation and the people if a coal ash spill occurs and contaminates the land and waterways? There are many coal ash spills that have occurred at other power plant locations across the country even at locations that state their coal ash ponds are lined. What is OSM, APS, EPA’s plan if a coal ash spill occurs in the next 25 years?	FCPP maintains an Emergency Action Plan which would be implemented in the event of impoundment failure. This is addressed in Section 4.15 of the Draft EIS.
1054.001	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley		6/27/14	The socioeconomic assessment does not portray the huge financial burden on the Navajo Nation for prolonging mine/power plant operations.	The FCCP and Navajo Mine Energy Project EIS includes an economic impact analysis and conclusions are presented in Section 4.10. The economic impact analysis estimates the distributional effects of an action on sectors of a regional economy, primarily by measuring the changes in employment and income within the geographic area where workers or businesses are most affected by the action. The economic impact analysis in the Draft EIS evaluated the economic impacts to the region of influence for the alternatives.
1054.002	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley		6/27/14	The cost of drought and climate impacts of 258 million mor tons of carbon pollution is also possible in the millions of dollars - but it is unknow because this info was not provided in the DEIS.	With respect to calculating the cost of drought and climate impacts for the Project. NEPA does not require a cost-benefit analysis, although CEQ NEPA regulations allow agencies to use it in NEPA analyses in certain circumstances (40 CFR § 1502.23). The CEQ regulation states (in part), “...for the purposes of complying with the Act, the weighing of the merits and drawbacks of various alternatives need not be displayed in a monetary cost-benefit analysis and should not be when there are important qualitative considerations.”  The Interagency Working Group (IWG) of federal agencies was convened in order to facilitate compliance with Executive Order 12866, which requires that agencies recognize costs and benefits of regulatory rulemaking, including the Social Cost of Carbon (SCC). The IWG developed a technical approach for monetizing the potential social cost from cumulative global emissions when developing regulation. The FCCP and Navajo Mine Energy Project EIS is not being prepared to support the promulgation of a regulation, but to inform the agencies’ decisions whether or not to approve certain operating permits, lease

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							<p>amendments and right-of-way renewals. However, a quantitative analysis of the social cost of carbon (SCC) has been added to the Final EIS in Section 4.2. The Draft EIS considered the SCC in a qualitative manner, but did not quantify the effects. Subsequent to issuance of the Draft EIS, CEQ published Draft Guidance on climate change analysis (CEQ 2014), in which CEQ indicates that emissions monetization is not required in every project-level NEPA analysis. Nonetheless, OSMRE determined that a quantitative analysis would be included in the Final EIS, following the Interagency Working Group Methods. The results of the SCC analysis do not change the conclusions or the findings of level of significance for the Climate Change issue; however, the analysis has been added to provide additional context to OSMRE's decision.</p> <p>The FCCP and Navajo Mine Energy Project EIS also includes an economic impact analysis, to be distinguished from a cost-benefit analysis. A cost-benefit analysis examines the economic efficiency of a proposed action—the net change in social welfare resulting from the costs and benefits of a proposal, including consideration of market and non-market values.</p> <p>Although an economic impact analysis was completed for this project, this is not the “benefit” side of a SCC cost-benefit analysis. The economic impact analysis estimates the distributional effects of an action on sectors of a regional economy, primarily by measuring the changes in employment and income within the geographic area where workers or businesses are most affected by the action. The economic impact analysis in the Draft EIS evaluated the economic impacts to the region of influence for the alternatives. However, this regional economic impact analysis in the Draft EIS was not a cost-benefit analysis, nor was it intended to quantify the social costs or benefits of fossil fuel development. Presenting the IWG SCC cost estimates quantitatively, without a complete monetary cost-benefit analysis which includes the social benefits of energy production, would be misleading.</p>
1055.001	Ms.	Colleen	Cooley		6/27/14	A thorough health impact assessment needs to be included in the Final EIS.	Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS addresses health and safety; specifically, pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarize the results of the human health risk assessment conducted for the project.
1056.001	Ms.	Roselyn	Begay		6/26/14	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1057.001		Davaugh	Yum		6/26/14	Renewable Energy!	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives
1057.002		Davaugh	Yum		6/26/14	Health Impact study!	Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS addresses health and safety; specifically, pages 4.17-22 through 4/17-24 summarize the results of the human health risk assessment conducted for the project. In addition, public health is addressed in the air quality analysis (Section 4.2), as well as project-specific analyses of health effects of diesel particulate matter and fugitive dust. The EIS also summarizes local health studies conducted by New Mexico Environment Department.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1058.001		Donoran	Johnson		6/26/14	Health Impact study	Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS addresses health and safety; specifically, pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarize the results of the human health risk assessment conducted for the project.
1058.002		Donoran	Johnson		6/26/14	We need water study	Water resources are addressed in Section 4.5 of the Draft EIS.
1058.003		Donoran	Johnson		6/26/14	Renewable Energy now.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives
1059.001	Mr.	Cooper	Curley		6/26/14	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1060.001	Ms.	Lita	Bizahaloni		6/26/14	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1061.001	Ms.	Betty	Nelson		6/26/14	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1062.001	Ms.	Dawn	Dyer		6/26/14	I believe that there should be an environmental impact statement done because the pollutants from the plant are hazardous to the environment and peoples health. These things have not been considered and need to be looked at closer.	The Draft EIS was published on March 28, 2014.
1063.001	Ms.	Angela	Ben		6/26/14	I know there are burial sites around the area of Navajo Mine and the FCPP. What happened to these sites? Where are the remains of the people that were living there once. These I've heard are being destroyed. And I know there is prehistoric remains of dinosaurs, sharks, shells, etc. What is being done to protect this place?	Section 4.4 of the Draft EIS addresses potential impacts to cultural resources and describes the Section 106 consultation process conducted as part of the project. Extensive tribal consultation has occurred as part of the Section 106 process. Programmatic agreements have been prepared to address known sites within the FCPP, Navajo Mine, and transmission line areas of potential effect. Paleontological resources are addressed in Section 4.3 of the Draft EIS.
1064.001	Mr.	Wiltis	Begaye		6/26/14	Why was there no EIS public speaking?	Please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format
1065.001	Mr.	R.G.	Hunt		6/26/14	BHP Navajo Mine and Four Corners Power Plant should have been a combined entity from the beginning, therefore all previous EIS should be void. And they should be starting fresh with a new EIS and be under a community oversight.	Thank you for the comment. No prior EIS has been conducted for either entity. The EIS prepared under NEPA Regulations is required to assist federal agencies in making informed decisions and is not a regulatory permit. The regulatory framework applicable to the Navajo Mine and FCPP is described within each resource area section in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS.
1066.001	Ms.	Mishauna	Todacheenie		6/26/14	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1067.001	Ms.	Jean	Begay		6/26/14	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1068.001	Mr.	Ray	Hogue		6/26/14	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1069.001	Mr.	Justin	Toledo		6/26/14	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1070.001	Mrs.	Jeanette	Gutierrez		6/26/14	We need a health study done in our area.	Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS addresses health and safety; specifically, pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarize the results of the human health risk assessment conducted for the project. In addition, public health is addressed in the air quality analysis (Section 4.1), as well as project-specific analyses of health effects of diesel particulate matter and fugitive dust. The EIS also summarizes local health studies conducted by New Mexico Environment Department.
1071.001	Mr.	Ray	Hogue		6/26/14	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1072.001	Ms.	Lucille	Willie		6/26/14	Also give us a health study for our water and land.	Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS addresses health and safety; specifically, pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarize the results of the human health risk assessment conducted for the project.  Water resources are addressed in Section 4.5 of the Draft EIS, Land Use is addressed in Section 4.9.
1073.001	Mr.	Santiago	Gutierrez		6/26/14	We need a health study done.	Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS addresses health and safety; specifically, pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarize the results of the human health risk assessment conducted for the project.
1074.001	Mr.	Orlando	Begay		6/26/14	Health studies needs to happen in the Four Corners.	Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS addresses health and safety; specifically, pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarize the results of the human health risk assessment conducted for the project.
1075.001	Mr.	Terrance	Chavez		6/26/14	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1076.001	Mr.	Jonathan	Perry		6/26/14	It is best to have Navajo translators to be at all public hearings and make more information available at more regions across the Navajo Nation.	Please see Master Response #10, Translation of the EIS
1077.001	Ms.	Debra	Wheeler		6/26/14	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1078.001	Mr.	Bill	McKinley		6/26/14	What happens to the fly ash? How is it contained and where is it stored.	Section 2.2 describes the current storage of coal combustion residues at the FCPP. EPA published its Final Rule for Hazardous and Solid Waste Management System; Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals from Electrical Utilities on December 19, 2014. Under the Final Rule, EPA has determined that CCR will be regulated under Subtitle D (non-hazardous) as a solid waste. The regulation is self-implementing and applies to the disposal of CCR generated from coal-fired generating stations, including tribal lands. The rule includes provisions for dust control and groundwater monitoring. The regulation does not extend to placement of CCR in mines. The Final EIS has been updated accordingly to reflect the Final Rule and its applicability to CCR disposal at the FCPP. A comprehensive discussion of the rule, its provisions, and enforceability is provided in Section 4.15, Hazardous Materials and Wastes. In addition, specific provisions of the rule that apply to other resource areas (i.e. water and air) are included in Sections 4.1, 4.5, 4.11, and 4.18.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1079.001	Ms.	Natasha	Yazzie		6/26/14	We don't understand why you have not done your health and environmental studies years ago	OSMRE and other agency jurisdiction over this NEPA process did not begin until applications were submitted to the respective agencies. Baseline environmental monitoring and studies conducted by the project proponents were used to assist in the preparation of the Draft EIS.
1080.001	Ms.	Janene	Yazzie		6/26/2014	Please utilize independent firms to conduct the EIS evaluations to study the impacts on public health and the culmulative impacts on surface, ground & run-off water, our air, soil & ecosystems.	The EIS was prepared by OSMRE with assistance from an independent contractor, in accordance with CEQ guidelines and OSMRE NEPA Handbook.
1081.001	Ms.	Cynthia	Linton		6/26/2014	Every one of us living in Shiprock demand a health study done & our water need studies with all the coal ash near the Chaco River and all the coal ash that had been dump back in the open pit mine.	Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS addresses health and safety; specifically, pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarizes the results of the human health risk assessment conducted for the project. Water resources are addressed in Section 4.5 of the Draft EIS, including a summary of the study of potential effect from historic placement of coal combustion residuals in the Navajo Mine.
1082.001	Ms.	Reanna	Henera		6/26/2014	Our old and non English speaking across the board got cheated of EIS comment open house because the poster style show case comment making is not their way. My people ask for a real comment hearings but you refused them the opportunity to express their comments.	Please see Master Response #9, Public Meeting Format and Master Response #10, Translation of the EIS
1082.002	Ms.	Reanna	Henera		6/26/2014	We still water studies and health studies.	Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS addresses health and safety; specifically, pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarizes the results of the human health risk assessment conducted for the project. Water resources are addressed in Section 4.5 of the Draft EIS.
1083.001	Mr.	Ivan	Palmer		6/26/2014	What we need is a health study! Like I said before we the people are dealing with sickness and disease.	Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS addresses health and safety; specifically, pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarizes the results of the human health risk assessment conducted for the project.
1084.001	Ms.	Marietta	Gutierrez		6/26/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment
1085.001	Ms.	Roselyn	Begay		6/26/2014	I have a concern solution on this air pollution that surroudns on our living area in (Area III), coal dust and fly ash.	Thank you for your comment. Air Quality is addressed in Section 4.1 of the Draft EIS.
1086.001	Ms.	Amelia	Luckton		6/26/2014	This place use to be beatiful but now you look around and see yellow skies and hear about people being sick a lot and crops aren't growing as they once had.	Thank you for your comment. Visibility is addressed in Section 4.1, Air Quality, of the Draft EIS. Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS addresses health and safety; specifically, pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarize the results of the human health risk assessment conducted for the project.
1087.001	Mr.	Edward	Evans		6/26/2014	The Navajo Mine is an ugly place. The ash pits, the diggin. The FCPP is a dirty powerplant. We need to protect our future generations. These two entities are and have been polluting long too too long.	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.
1087.002	Mr.	Edward	Evans		6/26/2014	Clean energy	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1088.001		Jalisa	Begay		6/26/2014	Navajo Mine and the Four Corners Power Plant create fly ash blow on our mesas especially with the recent winds. Whos doing the clean up. We live in haze and drought.	Thank you for your comment. The EIS addresses potential impacts from fly ash handling and disposal.
1089.001	Ms.	Rhonda	Hunt		6/26/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1090.001		Cordell	Tulley		6/26/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1091.001	Ms.	Mandee	Belore		6/26/2014	I love to fish, but I can't eat them I'm afraid of the pollution caused by APS/BHP.	Please see Master Response #4, Mercury in Fish in Nearby Lakes
1092.001	Ms.	Cindy	Dixon		6/26/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1093.001		R.G.	Hunt, III		6/26/2014	BHP and Four Corners powerplant should be penalized for all previous pollution. And current pollution.	Thank you for your comment. The Navajo Mine and FCPP have operated in accordance with all applicable federal regulations and the lease agreements with the Navajo Nation. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015. Penalties for past and/or current impacts are not a part of the actions considered by OSMRE.
1094.001	Ms.	Cindy	Dixon		6/26/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment
1095.001	Ms.	Lucille	Willie		6/26/2014	My sheep go out and eat the grass and brushes every day and I want them to eat good clean grazing grass but with all this pollution from the coal power plant there is no clean water and no clean grazing grass. More studies need to be done.	Potential impacts to water resources are addressed in Section 4.5 of the Draft EIS. Impacts to agriculture, including grazing, are addressed in Section 4.9 of the Draft EIS. With regard to the sufficiency of studies used for the EIS, please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1096.001	Ms.	Joella	Ashik		6/26/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1097.001	Ms.	Lucy A.	Willie		6/26/2014	We need health studies here in the Four Corners, and water studies. We want to make sure our water is clean for future use. We need air study too. The power plant has been here for over 50 years and the coal mine and it has never been study. For all these years of 50 year you should have enough money to do a complete study.	Thank you for your comment. Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS addresses potential impacts with regard to Health and Safety, including worker safety. Pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarize the human health risk assessment conducted for the project. Air Quality is addressed in Section 4.1 and Water Resources are addressed in Section 4.5. Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1098.001	Ms.	Roselyn H.	Begay		6/26/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1099.001	Ms.	Kimberly	Henry		6/26/2014	We need renewable energy. The days of dirty energy are over. The Four Corners power plant and Navajo Mine have been here long enough. I'm tired of the pollution. Who's getting rich off of our health?	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1100.001	Mr.	Marcos	Gutierrez		6/26/2014	Your studies on the water, pollution which is air quality, sacred sites are not done right. The EPA just rule the Four Corners has the most dirtier air. The air is not clean. Health study have to be done and soon.	Thank you for your comment. Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS addresses potential impacts with regard to Health and Safety, including worker safety. Pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarize the human health risk assessment conducted for the project. Air Quality is addressed in Section 4.1 and Water Resources are addressed in Section 4.5. Please see Master Response #1, Deficient Analysis
1101.001	Ms.	Cynthia	Bates		6/26/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1101.002	Ms.	Cynthia	Bates		6/26/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1102.001	Ms.	Cindy	Dixon		6/26/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1103.001		Shelby	Staley		6/26/2014	There are 17 toxic pollutants found in coal ash including arsenic, mercury, cadmium, boron, selenium, and other toxic metals. Affects the brain, lungs, heart, intestines and kidneys. And there are no tribal, state or federal regulations to clean up or monitor coal ash. Who will be responsible for 100 million tons of coal ash?	The FCPP partners are responsible for the long-term liability associated with coal ash, both at the impoundments and stored in the mine.
1104.001	Ms.	Cindy	Dixon		6/26/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comments.
1105.001	Ms.	Lucy	Willie		6/26/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1106.001	Mr.	Willis	Begaye		6/26/2014	You already destroyed the bureal sites. We ask question but no answer from your department.	Section 4.4 of the Draft EIS addresses potential impacts to cultural resources and describes the Section 106 consultation process conducted as part of the project. Extensive tribal consultation has occurred as part of the Section 106 process. All consultation and coordination activities conducted are described in Section 5 of the Draft EIS (and have been updated in the Final EIS).
1106.002	Mr.	Willis	Begaye		6/26/2014	Coal ash fly all over the community in the Four Corners. When are you clean this up.	The EIS included the results of site-specific soils analysis and air quality analysis that did not find this effect. Cleanup is addressed in a programmatic way under the No Action alternative.
1106.003	Mr.	Willis	Begaye		6/26/2014	No more ground water due to the coal mine. Where you going to get us water for our livestock.	The coal mine does not use groundwater for its operations, as stated in Section 4.5. A complete discussion of potential impacts to groundwater quantity and quality is provided in Section 4.5 of the Draft EIS.
1107.001	Mr.	Marshall	Johnson		6/26/2014	No considering was weighed on the land, water, and air. The value of from the biologist view & perspective of Dine (Navajo) traditional & fundamental law.	Diné Law reflects the importance to the Navajo Nation that their lands and resources are managed in accordance with the Tribe's cultural beliefs. Diné Law emphasizes the deep relationship of the Navajo with the Earth and outlines the Navajo "way of life". OSMRE recognizes and respects the intent and nature of this tribal policy. The purpose of NEPA is to assess how project alternatives could potentially affect the ecological and the human environment, thus, the NEPA process reflects the concepts of environmental stewardship outlined in Diné Law. Diné Law, however, does not include any measureable and enforceable regulatory standards that could be technically applied to the vast majority

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
							of resources analyzed in the EIS. In order to clarify the role of Diné Law in this NEPA process, the EIS has been revised to include the following language in a footnote in Section 1.4.2.6 on the applicability of Diné Law on the Project; the Navajo Nation is responsible for administering Dine Law their tribal trust lands: It is worth noting that in 2007 the Navajo Nation developed legislation (1 Navajo Nation Code §§ 201-206) that codified Diné Law. Diné Law explains the origin of the Navajo people and their relationship with the Earth. This Navajo law is considered cultural in nature and lacks any measurable and enforceable regulatory standards that could be technically applied to measure effects; therefore, Diné Law is not used as a regulatory framework in this EIS. Further information on Diné Law, related to the use of the Hogan at the Navajo Mine for traditional Navajo ceremonies for purposes of mitigating adverse impacts to the natural world from resource extraction, can be found on page 4.11-17.
1108.001	Ms.	Cindy	Dixon		6/26/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1109.001	Mr.	Darwin	Ashike		6/26/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1110.001	Ms.	Michelle	Yazzie		6/26/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.,
1111.001	Ms.	Cindy	Dixon		6/26/2014	Coal dust covers the grazing areas especially when the blasting occurs, & when it gets windy.	The EIS included the results of site-specific soils analysis and air quality analysis that did not find this effect.
1112.001	Ms.	Veronica	Johnson		6/26/2014	We need to shut down all the grandfathers coal power plant and replace them with clean energy like solar and wind power.	Please see Master Response #2 Renewable Energy Alternatives
1113.001	Ms.	Catherine	Gollaher		6/26/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1114.001	Mr.	Roland L.	Jack		6/26/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1115.001	Ms.	Marsha	Dawes		6/26/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1116.001	Mr.	Warren	Todacheenie		6/26/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1117.001	Ms.	Roselyn	Begay		6/26/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1118.001	Mr.	Christopher A. Mike	Bitah		6/26/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1119.001	Ms.	Molly	Hogue		6/26/2014	EIS is not going to help us feel healthy, you need to do a health studies.	Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS addresses health and safety; specifically, pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarizes the results of the human health risk assessment conducted for the project.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1120.001	Mr.	Ivan	Palmer		6/26/2014	What are they doing with the coal ash?	A description of coal combustion residue disposal is provided in Section 2.2 of the Draft EIS. EPA published its Final Rule for Hazardous and Solid Waste Management System; Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals from Electrical Utilities on December 19, 2014. Under the Final Rule, EPA has determined that CCR will be regulated under Subtitle D (non-hazardous) as a solid waste. The regulation is self-implementing and applies to the disposal of CCR generated from coal-fired generating stations, including tribal lands. The rule includes provisions for dust control and groundwater monitoring. The regulation does not extend to placement of CCR in mines. The Final EIS has been updated accordingly to reflect the Final Rule and its applicability to CCR disposal at the FCPP. A comprehensive discussion of the rule, its provisions, and enforceability is provided in Section 4.15, Hazardous Materials and Wastes. In addition, specific provisions of the rule that apply to other resource areas (i.e. water and air) are included in Sections 4.1, 4.5, 4.11, and 4.18.
1121.001	Ms.	Jean	Begay		6/26/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1122.001	Ms.	Delores	Aguirre		6/26/2014	Stand together on clean air act, and environmental justice. Environmental impact statement is not our way, it is done in a way we don't understand so for us to make it clear coal mine and coal power plants need to retire. We deserve clean air and healthy life.	Thank you for your comment. Please see Master Response #10 Translation of the EIS. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.
1123.001		Anonymous				No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1124.001	Mr.	Joe C.	Allen			No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1125.001	Mr.	Joe C.	Allen			No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1126.001	Mr	Monty	John		5/7/2014	The state of New Mexico and Navajo Tribe have benefited from all the millions of tax dollars and royalties monies the company has paid through the years for support the governments. BHP agreed to give the tribe a loan to by Navajo Mine, which I support because its and investment in the tribe can use to generate income for future generations. I support APS to continue to provide employment to their workers and to find solution to work with the government agencies not to totally shut down the power plant. Jobs are needed to support our families on the Navajo reservation. Summer jobs are needed for our students. I support BHP effort to provide jobs	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS. OSMRE is considering all alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision in the Record of Decision, anticipated to be published spring 2015.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1127.001	Mr	Wayne	S		5/7/2014	The state of New Mexico and Navajo Tribe have benefited from all the millions of tax dollars and royalties monies the company has paid through the years for support the governments. BHP agreed to give the tribe a loan to by Navajo Mine, which I support because its and investment in the tribe can use to generate income for future generations. I support APSto continue to provide employment to their workers and to find solution to work with the government agencies not to totally shut down the power plant. Jobs are needed to support our families on the Navajo reservation. Summer jobs are needed for our students. I support BHP effort to provide jobs	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS. OSMRE is considering all alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision in the Record of Decision, anticipated to be published spring 2015.
1128.001	Mr	Dewayne	W		5/7/2014	The state of New Mexico and Navajo Tribe have benefited from all the millions of tax dollars and royalties monies the company has paid through the years for support the governments. BHP agreed to give the tribe a loan to by Navajo Mine, which I support because its and investment in the tribe can use to generate income for future generations. I support APSto continue to provide employment to their workers and to find solution to work with the government agencies not to totally shut down the power plant. Jobs are needed to support our families on the Navajo reservation. Summer jobs are needed for our students. I support BHP effort to provide jobs	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS. OSMRE is considering all alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision in the Record of Decision, anticipated to be published spring 2015.
1129.001	Mr	Walter	Begaye		5/7/2014	The state of New Mexico and Navajo Tribe have benefited from all the millions of tax dollars and royalties monies the company has paid through the years for support the governments. BHP agreed to give the tribe a loan to by Navajo Mine, which I support because its and investment in the tribe can use to generate income for future generations. I support APSto continue to provide employment to their workers and to find solution to work with the government agencies not to totally shut down the power plant. Jobs are needed to support our families on the Navajo reservation. Summer jobs are needed for our students. I support BHP effort to provide jobs	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS. OSMRE is considering all alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision in the Record of Decision, anticipated to be published spring 2015.
1130.001		C.	E.		5/7/2014	The state of New Mexico and Navajo Tribe have benefited from all the millions of tax dollars and royalties monies the company has paid through the years for support the governments. BHP agreed to give the tribe a loan to by Navajo Mine, which I support because its and investment in the tribe can use to generate income for future generations. I support APSto continue to provide employment to their workers and to find solution to work with the government agencies not to totally shut down the power plant. Jobs are needed to support our families on the Navajo reservation. Summer jobs are needed for our students. I support BHP effort to provide jobs	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS. OSMRE is considering all alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision in the Record of Decision, anticipated to be published spring 2015.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1131.001					5/7/2014	The state of New Mexico and Navajo Tribe have benefited from all the millions of tax dollars and royalties monies the company has paid through the years for support the governments. BHP agreed to give the tribe a loan to by Navajo Mine, which I support because its and investment in the tribe can use to generate income for future generations. I support APSto continue to provide employment to their workers and to find solution to work with the government agencies not to totally shut down the power plant. Jobs are needed to support our families on the Navajo reservation. Summer jobs are needed for our students. I support BHP effort to provide jobs	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS. OSMRE is considering all alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision in the Record of Decision, anticipated to be published spring 2015.
1132.001					5/7/2014	The state of New Mexico and Navajo Tribe have benefited from all the millions of tax dollars and royalties monies the company has paid through the years for support the governments. BHP agreed to give the tribe a loan to by Navajo Mine, which I support because its and investment in the tribe can use to generate income for future generations. I support APSto continue to provide employment to their workers and to find solution to work with the government agencies not to totally shut down the power plant. Jobs are needed to support our families on the Navajo reservation. Summer jobs are needed for our students. I support BHP effort to provide jobs	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS. OSMRE is considering all alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision in the Record of Decision, anticipated to be published spring 2015.
1133.001		H.	B.		5/7/2014	The state of New Mexico and Navajo Tribe have benefited from all the millions of tax dollars and royalties monies the company has paid through the years for support the governments. BHP agreed to give the tribe a loan to by Navajo Mine, which I support because its and investment in the tribe can use to generate income for future generations. I support APSto continue to provide employment to their workers and to find solution to work with the government agencies not to totally shut down the power plant. Jobs are needed to support our families on the Navajo reservation. Summer jobs are needed for our students. I support BHP effort to provide jobs	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS. OSMRE is considering all alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision in the Record of Decision, anticipated to be published spring 2015.
1134.001	Mr	Gilbert	Todea		5/7/2014	The state of New Mexico and Navajo Tribe have benefited from all the millions of tax dollars and royalties monies the company has paid through the years for support the governments. BHP agreed to give the tribe a loan to by Navajo Mine, which I support because its and investment in the tribe can use to generate income for future generations. I support APSto continue to provide employment to their workers and to find solution to work with the government agencies not to totally shut down the power plant. Jobs are needed to support our families on the Navajo reservation. Summer jobs are needed for our students. I support BHP effort to provide jobs	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS. OSMRE is considering all alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision in the Record of Decision, anticipated to be published spring 2015.
1135.001		R.G.	Hunt		6/27/2014	And there has never, never has been an environemtnal health study done on these poor inooent people living here.	Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS addresses health and safety; specifically, pages 4.17-22 through 4.17-24 summarizes the results of the human health risk assessment conducted for the project.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1136.001	Ms.	Lucinda	Yellowman-Bennalley		6/14/2014	No substantive comment.	Thank you for your comment.
1137.001	Mr.	Kevin	Talbott		7/15/2014	This MMC and associated operations bring much needed revenue and supports much need jobs in the Farmington area.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
1138.001	Mr.	Tyreks	Chavez		7/15/2014	Navajo mine helps many with jobs, to local charities. I believe without the mine many of us will suffer dearly.	Thank you for your comment. A complete discussion of Socioeconomics is provided in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIS.
1139.001	Ms.	Tara	Bloyd	Wild Earth Guardians	6/15/2014	I am dissappointed that the Office of Surface Mining has rejected any alternative that would provide for the transition of the Four Corners power plant from coal to clean energy.	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives
1139.002	Ms.	Tara	Bloyd	Wild Earth Guardians	6/15/2014	The Office of Surface Mining has authority to reject applications for new coal mining permits. I urge you to use that authority to adopt a No Action Alternative that would reject more coal mining given the significant threat that it poses to our climate, our health, and our nation.	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.
1139.003	Ms.	Tara	Bloyd	Wild Earth Guardians	6/15/2014	The Office of Surface Mining has an oppotunity to help communities in American Southwest, including on the Navjo Nation, move behond fossil fuels and reap the benefits of clean energy.	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all of the alternatives that were analyzed in the Draft EIS and will inform the public of its decision via the Record of Decision, anticipated in the spring of 2015.
1140.000	Ms.	Marjorie	Young	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
1141.000	Mr.	Goran	Abrami	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
1142.000	Ms.	Veronica	Rehne	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
1143.000	Ms.	Jean	Saja	WildEarth Guardians	7/13/2014	same form letter	
1144.000	Ms.	Elizabeth	Marino	WildEarth Guardians	7/13/2014	same form letter	
1145.000	Ms.	Erica	Friedman	WildEarth Guardians	7/13/2014	same form letter	
1146.000	Mr.	Dan	Noiret	WildEarth Guardians	7/14/2014	same form letter	
1147.000	Ms.	Angelique	Post	WildEarth Guardians	7/14/2014	same form letter	
1148.000	Ms.	Heather McCandless		WildEarth Guardians	7/14/2014	same form letter	
1149.000	Ms.	Lisa	Salazar	WildEarth Guardians	7/12/2014	same form letter	
1150.000	Dr.	Shannon	Saldana	WildEarth Guardians	7/12/2014	same form letter	
1151.000	Mr.	Duane	Gustafson	WildEarth Guardians	7/11/2014	same form letter	
1152.000	Ms.	Kim	Dieter	WildEarth Guardians	7/10/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1153.000	Ms.	Sylvia	Jones	WildEarth Guardians	7/10/2014	same form letter	
1154.000	Ms.	Margaret	Keene	WildEarth Guardians	7/10/2014	same form letter	
1155.000	Ms.	Chiara	Simbolotti	WildEarth Guardians	7/9/2014	same form letter	
1156.000	Ms.	Ruth	Darden	WildEarth Guardians	7/9/2014	same form letter	
1157.000	Ms.	Katie	Werner	WildEarth Guardians	7/9/2014	same form letter	
1158.000	Ms.	Kristina	Bain	WildEarth Guardians	7/9/2014	same form letter	
1159.000	Ms.	Deborah	Serio	WildEarth Guardians	7/5/2014	same form letter	
1160.000	Ms.	Mary-Ann	Sodrel	WildEarth Guardians	7/5/2014	same form letter	
1161.000	Ms.	Sophie	Laulik	WildEarth Guardians	7/5/2014	same form letter	
1162.000	Mr.	Derek	Gendvil	WildEarth Guardians	7/5/2014	same form letter	
1163.000	Ms.	Tracy	Holthaus	WildEarth Guardians	7/5/2014	same form letter	
1164.000	Ms.	Elaine	Conway	WildEarth Guardians	7/6/2014	same form letter	
1165.000	Ms.	Mimi	Attleson	WildEarth Guardians	7/6/2014	same form letter	
1166.000	Ms.	Sue	Skimore	WildEarth Guardians	7/6/2014	same form letter	
1167.000	Ms.	Lena	Williams	WildEarth Guardians	7/6/2014	same form letter	
1168.000	Mr.	Bob	Brister	WildEarth Guardians	7/6/2014	same form letter	
1169.000	Ms.	Gwen	Deters	WildEarth Guardians	7/6/2014	same form letter	
1170.000	Mrs.	Sylvie	C	WildEarth Guardians	7/6/2014	same form letter	
1171.000	Ms.	Malvia	McIntosh	WildEarth Guardians	7/6/2014	same form letter	
1172.000	Mr.	Henry	Berkowitz	WildEarth Guardians	7/6/2014	same form letter	
1173.000	Mrs.	Susan	Navidad	WildEarth Guardians	7/7/2014	same form letter	
1174.000	Ms.	Donna	Jenks-Brown	WildEarth Guardians	7/7/2014	same form letter	
1175.000	Mrs.	Nancy	Schechterle	WildEarth Guardians	7/7/2014	same form letter	
1176.000	Ms.	Ana	Cecilia Oro	WildEarth Guardians	7/7/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1177.000	Mr.	Paul	Sullivan	WildEarth Guardians	7/7/2014	same form letter	
1178.000	Miss	Siloh	wolfe	WildEarth Guardians	7/7/2014	same form letter	
1179.000	Mr.	Patrick	Sennello	WildEarth Guardians	7/7/2014	same form letter	
1180.000	Ms.	Jana	Titus	WildEarth Guardians	7/8/2014	same form letter	
1181.000	Mr.	Jan-Paul	Alon	WildEarth Guardians	6/30/2014	same form letter	
1182.000	Ms.	Shari	Eubanks	WildEarth Guardians	6/30/2014	same form letter	
1183.000	Ms.	Meghan	Houston	WildEarth Guardians	6/30/2014	same form letter	
1184.000	Mr.	Gordon	Parker III	WildEarth Guardians	6/30/2014	same form letter	
1185.000	Mr.	Michael	Knight	WildEarth Guardians	6/30/2014	same form letter	
1186.000	Ms.	Jackie	Tryggeseth	WildEarth Guardians	6/30/2014	same form letter	
1187.000	Mrs.	Annette	Overstreet	WildEarth Guardians	6/30/2014	same form letter	
1188.000	Ms.	Jackie	Johnston	WildEarth Guardians	6/30/2014	same form letter	
1189.000	Dr.	Tracy	Ouellette	WildEarth Guardians	6/30/2014	same form letter	
1190.000	Mr.	Martin	Bernard	WildEarth Guardians	6/30/2014	same form letter	
1191.000	Ms.	Nancy	Dolland	WildEarth Guardians	7/1/2014	same form letter	
1192.000	Ms.	Yee	Yean Lim	WildEarth Guardians	7/1/2014	same form letter	
1193.000	Dr.	Alex	Blin	WildEarth Guardians	7/1/2014	same form letter	
1194.000	Mr.	Michael	Haskell	WildEarth Guardians	7/1/2014	same form letter	
1195.000	Ms.	Mary-Ann	Platter-Rieger	WildEarth Guardians	7/1/2014	same form letter	
1196.000	Ms.	Gail & John	Richardson	WildEarth Guardians	7/1/2014	same form letter	
1197.000	Miss	Viridiana	Licona	WildEarth Guardians	7/1/2014	same form letter	
1198.000	Ms.	Elise	Allen	WildEarth Guardians	7/1/2014	same form letter	
1199.000	Ms.	Elaine	Kuperstein	WildEarth Guardians	7/1/2014	same form letter	
1200.000	Ms.	Diane	Stayner	WildEarth Guardians	7/1/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1201.000	Miss	C.	Connor	WildEarth Guardians	7/1/2014	same form letter	
1202.000	Dr.	Susan	Caswell	WildEarth Guardians	7/1/2014	same form letter	
1203.001	Dr.	Marina	Jirotko	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
1204.000	Ms.	Annette	Bailey	WildEarth Guardians	7/1/2014	same form letter	
1205.000	Mrs.	Diane	Gubrud	WildEarth Guardians	7/1/2014	same form letter	
1206.000	Miss	Laetitia	Petit	WildEarth Guardians	7/2/2014	same form letter	
1207.000	Mr.	Jason	Chin	WildEarth Guardians	7/2/2014	same form letter	
1208.000	Mr.	Mario	Giannone	WildEarth Guardians	7/2/2014	same form letter	
1209.000	Dr.	Robert	Janusko	WildEarth Guardians	7/2/2014	same form letter	
1210.000	Ms.	Susan	Meyer	WildEarth Guardians	7/2/2014	same form letter	
1211.000	Mrs.	Beverly	Kroening	WildEarth Guardians	7/2/2014	same form letter	
1212.000	Ms.	Nanette	Oggiono	WildEarth Guardians	7/2/2014	same form letter	
1213.000	Ms.	Annette	Odonnell	WildEarth Guardians	7/2/2014	same form letter	
1214.000	Ms.	I	S	WildEarth Guardians	7/2/2014	same form letter	
1215.000	Mrs.	Joanne	Saviano	WildEarth Guardians	7/2/2014	same form letter	
1216.000	Mr.	Dean	Windh	WildEarth Guardians	7/2/2014	same form letter	
1217.000	Ms.	Susan	Evans	WildEarth Guardians	7/2/2014	same form letter	
1218.000	Ms.	Janet	Neihart	WildEarth Guardians	7/2/2014	same form letter	
1219.000	Mr.	Matt	LaPlante	WildEarth Guardians	7/2/2014	same form letter	
1220.000	Ms.	Renee	Lusian	WildEarth Guardians	7/2/2014	same form letter	
1221.000	Ms.	Cheryl	Ferguson	WildEarth Guardians	7/2/2014	same form letter	
1222.000	Mrs.	Summer	Kozisek	WildEarth Guardians	7/3/2014	same form letter	
1223.000	Miss	Isabel	Cervera	WildEarth Guardians	7/3/2014	same form letter	
1224.000	Mr.	Bruce	Klinka	WildEarth Guardians	7/3/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1225.000	Mr.	Joseph	Alfano	WildEarth Guardians	7/3/2014	same form letter	
1226.000	Ms.	Rebecca	Harper	WildEarth Guardians	7/3/2014	same form letter	
1227.000	Ms.	Linda	Dunne	WildEarth Guardians	7/3/2014	same form letter	
1228.000	Mr.	John	Sodrel	WildEarth Guardians	7/3/2014	same form letter	
1229.000	Dr.	tom	Dorsey	WildEarth Guardians	7/3/2014	same form letter	
1230.000	Mrs.	Dewi	Jung	WildEarth Guardians	7/3/2014	same form letter	
1231.000	Ms.	Leona	Grage	WildEarth Guardians	7/3/2014	same form letter	
1232.000	Mrs.	Sanja	Lalic Valecic	WildEarth Guardians	7/4/2014	same form letter	
1233.000	Ms.	Olga	Cairns	WildEarth Guardians	7/4/2014	same form letter	
1234.000	Ms.	Samira	Haraoui	WildEarth Guardians	7/4/2014	same form letter	
1235.000	Mrs.	Amanda	Withrow	WildEarth Guardians	7/4/2014	same form letter	
1236.000	Mr.	William	Collins	WildEarth Guardians	7/4/2014	same form letter	
1237.000	Ms.	Marth	Leahy	WildEarth Guardians	7/4/2014	same form letter	
1238.000	Ms.	Cheryl	Twaddell	WildEarth Guardians	7/5/2014	same form letter	
1239.000	Mr.	Gary	Parlettegary	WildEarth Guardians	7/5/2014	same form letter	
1240.000	Mr.	Andrew	Ireland	WildEarth Guardians	7/5/2014	same form letter	
1241.000	Mrs.	Mylee	Khristoforov	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1242.000	Ms.	Jennifer	McDaniel	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1243.000	Ms.	Joycetta	Jones	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1244.000	Mrs.	Kimberly	Gilbertson	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1245.000	Ms.	Naomi	Hood	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1246.000	Ms.	Michelle	Riner	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1247.000	Ms.	Glynis	Boyd	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1248.000	Ms.	Daniela	Bress	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1249.000	Ms.	Mel	Safken	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1250.000	Mr.	Craig	Webster	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1251.000	Ms.	Alice	McGough	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1252.000	Ms.	Tiffany	Goforth	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1253.000	Mr.	Mike	Vanlandingham	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1254.000	Ms.	Erica	St John	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1255.000	Miss	Salwah	Koriya	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1256.000	Dr.	Vanessa	Aguiar	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1257.000	Ms.	Al'bina	Sharipova	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1258.000	Ms.	Brigid	Courtney	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1259.000	Mr.	Klaus	Steinbrecher	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1260.000	Mr.	corey	Benjamin	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1261.000	Mrs.	Sara	Wersinger	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1262.000	Ms.	Sheri	Bresson	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1263.000	Mr.	Douglas	Mason	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1264.000	Mr.	Bob	Fay	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1265.000	Ms.	Suzanne	Dunham	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1266.000	Mrs.	Karen	Pike-roberts	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1267.000	Dr.	Carol Joan	Patterson	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1268.000	Ms.	Theresa	Badus	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1269.000	Ms.	Irene	Simmons	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1270.000	Ms.	Judith	Hazelton	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1271.000	Mrs.	Helena	Hernandez	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1272.000	Mr.	Neil	Norton	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1273.000	Dr.	Lorraine	Martinez	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1274.000	Mr.	Joe	McKean	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1275.000	Mrs.	Yettie	Bloodworth	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1276.000	Ms.	Lisa	Kucukdogerli	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1277.000	Ms.	Janell	Smith	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1278.000	Ms.	Karen	Berger	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1279.000	Mr.	Jeffrey	Korn	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1280.000	Mr.	Michael C.	Ford	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1281.000	Dr.	Richard B.	Marks	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1282.000	Mrs.	Zara	Ivanova	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1283.000	Mrs.	Karen	Slote	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1284.000	Mrs.	Janice	Tinkham	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1285.000	Mr.	David	Land	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1286.000	Dr.	Chris	Hanks	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1287.000	Ms.	Margot	Serwer	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1288.000	Ms.	Jennifer	Gindt	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1289.000	Mrs.	Carrie	Eberhardt	WildEarth Guardians	6/29/2014	same form letter	
1290.000	Mr.	TW	Hunter	WildEarth Guardians	6/30/2014	same form letter	
1291.000	Mr.	Mike	Cosgrove	WildEarth Guardians	6/30/2014	same form letter	
1292.000	Mr.	Leon	Werdinger	WildEarth Guardians	6/30/2014	same form letter	
1293.000	Ms.	Krystal	Weillage	WildEarth Guardians	6/30/2014	same form letter	
1294.000	Ms.	Marda	DeWet	WildEarth Guardians	6/30/2014	same form letter	
1295.000	Dr.	Blake	Wilson	WildEarth Guardians	6/30/2014	same form letter	
1296.000	Ms.	Juli	Schaefer	WildEarth Guardians	6/30/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1297.000	Mrs.	Denise	Maurer	WildEarth Guardians	6/30/2014	same form letter	
1298.000	Mrs.	Tonia	Howe	WildEarth Guardians	6/30/2014	same form letter	
1299.000	Ms.	Alyssa	Watson	WildEarth Guardians	6/30/2014	same form letter	
1300.000	Ms.	Joanne	Beldin	WildEarth Guardians	6/30/2014	same form letter	
1301.000	Ms.	Friederike	Wesendahl	WildEarth Guardians	6/30/2014	same form letter	
1302.000	Ms.	Gail & Rick	Konopacki	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1303.000	Ms.	Suzanne	Bompensa	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1304.000	Mr.	Ray	Miller	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1305.000	Mr.	Ron	Voorhies	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1306.000	Miss	Praesens	Absens	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1307.000	Mrs.	Nancy	Neumann	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1308.000	Mrs.	Sandra	Arapoudis	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1309.000	Ms.	Carolyn	Watkinson	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1310.000	Mr.	Willem	Kom	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1311.000	Miss	Christina	Little	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1312.000	Ms.	Amanda	Albuquerque	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1313.000	Ms.	Geraldine	Card-Derr	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1314.000	Mr.	Henry	Medina	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1315.000	Mrs.	Susanne	Barry	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1316.000	Mrs.	Chelsea	Madison	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1317.000	Mrs.	Ruth	Smithson	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1318.000	Ms.	Maria	Schulz	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1319.000	Mr.	Anton	Wirth	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1320.000	Mrs.	Jacquelynn	Maruffo	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1321.000	Mr.	Andrew	Rose	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1322.000	Ms.	Catherine	Degraw	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1323.000	Mrs.	Laura	Menighetti	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1324.000	Mrs.	Junko	Card	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1325.000	Ms.	Irina	Lamadrid	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1326.000	Ms.	Elizabeth	Jackson	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1327.000	Mrs.	Elizabeth	Scherbak	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1328.000	Mr.	Francisco	Velez	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1329.000	Dr.	Martha WD	Bushnell	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1330.000	Mrs.	Tiffany	Buell	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1331.000	Ms.	Uta	Degener	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1332.000	Ms.	Vicki	Ferguson	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1333.000	Mr.	Carl	Clark	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1334.000	Ms.	R	Beaupre	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1335.000	Miss	Canan	Tzelil	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1336.000	Mrs.	Jessica	Tucker	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1337.000	Miss	Sussanna	Minacheili	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1338.000	Miss	Sharon	Wardle	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1339.000	Dr.	Kleomichele	Leeds	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1340.000	Miss	Akura	Makea-Pardington	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1341.000	Mrs.	Astrid, Theo, Jonathan, Julius	Keup	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1342.000	Mr.	Les	Roberts	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1343.000	Ms.	Chere	High	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1344.000	Ms.	Ana	R	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1345.000	Ms.	Diana	Hudspeth	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1346.000	Ms.	Karen	Wehrman	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1347.000	Ms.	Gianna	Vaccaro	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1348.000	Mr.	Thomas	Chillcott	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1349.000	Ms.	Carolyn	Pettis	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1350.000	Dr.	Emilia	Boccagna	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1351.000	Mr.	Art	Smoker	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1352.000	Ms.	Sophia	Furlan	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1353.000	Mr.	Eric	Lambart	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1354.000	Miss	Sandra	Couch	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1355.000	Mrs.	Gloria	Cameron	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1356.000	Ms.	Barbara	Kelly	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1357.000	Mr.	Nick	Barcott	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1358.000	Mrs.	Marlene	Jaar	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1359.000	Mr.	Code	Dolnick	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1360.000	Ms.	Kristin	Womack	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1361.000	Mrs.	Anna Elisabeth Mari	Riera	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1362.000	Mr.	robert	Okroi	WildEarth Guardians	6/28/2014	same form letter	
1363.000	Ms.	Sara	Williams	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1364.000	Ms.	Michelle	Duprene	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1365.000	Ms.	Kim	Hodgson	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1366.000	Ms.	Kathleen	Ruiz	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1367.000	Ms.	Rhonda	Bradley	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1368.000	Dr.	Stockton	Garver	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1369.000	Ms.	Tina	Cox	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1370.000	Mr.	Enzo	Mulas	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1371.001	Mrs.	Brenda	Gnader	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
1372.000	Mr.	Alex	Krause	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1373.000	Mr.	Richard B.	Krygowski	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1374.000	Mr.	Kevin	Chamas	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1375.000	Mr.	Jeffrey	Juel	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1376.000	Dr.	DJ	Carruthers	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1377.000	Mr.	Joseph	Wenzel	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1378.000	Ms.	Mary	Rausch	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1379.000	Ms.	Anne	Veraldi	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1380.000	Mr.	Ed	Pool	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1381.000	Ms.	Nancy	Eichler	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1382.000	Mrs.	Sara	Demari	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1383.000	Mrs.	Monica	Chanchi	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1384.000	Mrs.	Nancy	Howard	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1385.000	Ms.	Carol	Changus	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1386.000	Ms.	Cassandra	Suarez-Hanson	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1387.000	Mrs.	Melodie	Metje	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1388.000	Mr.	Toni	Thomas	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1389.000	Ms.	Michelle	Myers	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1390.000	Mr.	Adam	Mills	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1391.000	Mr.	Alex	Martinez	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1392.000	Mr.	John	Flitcraft	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1393.000	Ms.	Christine	Fitz-Gerlad	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1394.000	Ms.	Linda	Jones	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1395.000	Dr.	Marianna	Hartson	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1396.000	Ms.	Michele	Villeneuve	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1397.000	Ms.	Helen	Porter	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1398.000	Ms.	Margaret	Goodman	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1399.000	Ms.	Susan	Sebanc	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1400.000	Ms.	Rohana	Wolf	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1401.000	Ms.	Renee	Brinker	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1402.000	Ms.	Darcy	Bergh	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1403.001	Ms.	Theresa	Kelly	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
1404.000	Ms.	Megan	Smith	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1405.000	Mrs.	Anastasia	Schina	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1406.000	Miss	Aiming	Ermina	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1407.000	Mr.	Kinneyh	Evitt	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1408.000	Mr.	Ivan	Snaidar	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1409.000	Dr.	Robert	Gabriel	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1410.000	Dr.	Martha	Herrero	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1411.000	Mr.	Byron	Eatwell	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1412.000	Mr.	Don	Meriwether	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1413.000	Mrs.	Giana	Peranio-Paz	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1414.000	Mrs.	Dawn	Florio	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1415.000	Mrs.	Karen	Cignoli	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1416.000	Mr.	Steve	Farmer	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1417.000	Ms.	April	Aubin	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1418.000	Ms.	Alisa	Adobajor	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1419.000	Mr.	Joseph	Avetikyan	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1420.000	Mr.	Dennis	Kreiner	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1421.000	Ms.	Irini	D.	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1422.000	Mrs.	Arlene	Patoray	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter	
1423.000	Mr.	Larry	Andrews	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1424.000	Ms.	Rose	Graybill	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1425.000	Ms.	Malinda	Boughn	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1426.000	Mrs.	Bodhi	Kiohler	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1427.000	Ms.	Kate	Zinn	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1428.000	Mr.	Bruce	Culver	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1429.000	Ms.	Anja	Johansen	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1430.000	Mr.	Salvatore	Greco	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1431.000	Mr.	Kyle	Petlock	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1432.000	Miss	Claudia	Vismara	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1433.000	Ms.	Jeanette	Holmgren	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1434.000	Ms.	Mary	Payne	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1435.000	Mr.	Bill	Martens	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1436.000	Ms.	Iva	Turato	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1437.000	Ms.	Catherine	Ayoub	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1438.000	Miss	Bridget	Bailey	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1439.000	Ms.	Sarah	Cutler	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1440.000	Ms.	Michelle	Anderson	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1441.000	Ms.	Jennifer	Salhus	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1442.000	Ms.	Roseann	Divicino	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1443.000	Mrs.	Nancy	Towle	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1444.000	Mr.	Richard B.	Royer	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1445.000	Ms.	Sandy	Rasich	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1446.000	Mr.	Peter	Vars	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1447.000	Ms.	Betty	Trentlyon	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1448.000	Mr.	Christine	Hazynski	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1449.000	Dr.	Charles	Ayers	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1450.000	Ms.	Susan	Cox	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1451.000	Ms.	christine	Pikala	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1452.000	Miss	Victoria	Blackwell	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1453.000	Mrs.	Susan	Allen	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1454.000	Ms.	Kathy	Kuyper	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1455.000	Mr.	Christopher	Panayi	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1456.000	Mr.	William	Cope	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1457.000	Mr.	Bob	Thomas	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1458.000	Ms.	Betty	Alexander	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1459.000	Mrs.	Gail	Kallas	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1460.000	Ms.	Jane	Zinkl	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1461.001	Ms.	Vicki	Nosal	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
1462.000	Mrs.	Francine	Ungaro	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1463.000	Ms.	Joanne	Dixon	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1464.001	Mr.	Michael	Murphy	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1465.000	Ms.	Carol	Savary	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1466.000	Mr.	Eric	Burr	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1467.000	Mr.	Robert	McFarland	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1468.000	Ms.	Foora	Pino Garcia	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1469.000	Ms.	Cheryl	Costigan	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1470.000	Mr.	Bruce	Abbott	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1471.000	Ms.	Loraine	Wartick	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1472.000	Ms.	Patrice	Reinecke	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1473.000	Dr.	Ernest	Mecke	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1474.000	Ms.	Lorene	Wartick	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1475.000	Mr.	Freddie	Williams	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1476.001	Mr.	Kevin	O'Connor	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
1477.000	Mr.	Dan	Halen	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1478.000	Ms.	Janice	Wilfing	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1479.000	Ms.	Linda	Headley	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1480.000	Mr.	Nino	Ritchi	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1481.000	Mrs.	Sonia	Rego	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1482.000	Mr.	Saul	Aguirre	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1483.000	Mrs.	Paula	Murphy-Lopez	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1484.000	Ms.	Susan	Stoeckel	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1485.000	Mrs.	Laura	Smith	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1486.000	Dr.	Rebecca	Kraimer	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1487.000	Ms.	Kathy	Chaney	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1488.000	Mr.	Rupert	Veitch	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1489.000		Ronda	Butler-Villa	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1490.000	Ms.	Sue	Lesmond	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1491.000	Ms.	Ann	Sullivan	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1492.001	Mrs.	Lois	White	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
1493.000	Ms.	dianne	Douglas	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1494.000	Mr.	Jason	Brock	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1495.000	Mrs.	Rose	Sanchez	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1496.000	Mr.	Richard B.	Spratley	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1497.000	Ms.	Joanne	McAllister	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1498.000	Mr.	Thierry	Favre	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1499.000	Dr.	Jan	Modjeski	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1500.000	Mr.	Ian	Songan	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1501.000	Mr.	Marty	Landa	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1502.000	Dr.	Ken	Zafren	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1503.000	Ms.	Leslie	Smith	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1504.000	Ms.	Edith	Coleman	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1505.000	Ms.	Heidi	Aubrey	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1506.000	Ms.	Linda	Satter	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1507.000	Ms.	Lynn	Squance	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1508.000	Ms.	Lynn	Squance	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1509.000	Mr.	Brad	Nahill	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1510.000	Mr.	Joel	Finley	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1511.000	Mr.	Ronald	Ratner	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1512.000	Mr.	Mark	Holoubek	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1513.000	Mrs.	Sandra	Woodall	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1514.000	Mrs.	Edeltraut	Renk	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1515.000	Ms.	Colleen	Lobel	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1516.000	Mrs.	Julie	Griffith	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1517.000	Ms.	Karen Kravcov	Malcolm	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1518.001	Ms.	Sophe	Stine	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
1519.000	Ms.	Susan	Ross	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1520.000	Ms.	Marshalle	Genevieve	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1521.000	Mr.	Casey	Pittman	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1522.000	Ms.	Alex	Macchi	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1523.000	Mrs.	Gina	Rueck	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1524.000	Mrs.	Maria Teresa	Schollhorn	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1525.000	Dr.	Arghavan	Hajsheykholeslami	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1526.000	Mrs.	Debz	Jones	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1527.000	Ms.	Yvonne	Barker	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1528.000	Ms.	Twyla	Meyer	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1529.000	Mr.	Nicole	Maschke	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1530.000	Mr.	Kilaya	Ciriello	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1531.000	Ms.	Chaz	Berlusconi	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1532.000	Mrs.	Nancy	Keiter	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1533.000	Mr.	D	P.	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1534.000	Ms.	Cathleen	Kelly	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1535.000	Ms.	Annie	Wei	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1536.000	Mr.	Lorenz	Steininger	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1537.000	Mrs.	Girard	Catherine	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1538.000	Mrs.	Caroline	Wandl	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1539.000	Mrs.	Marianne	Maetz	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1540.000	Miss	Sos	Animali	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1541.000	Miss	Ruth E.	Martillo	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1542.000	Mr.	Eric	Horschak	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1543.000	Mrs.	Lilly	Kohler	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1544.000	Mrs.	Amala	Kohler	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1545.000	Ms.	Iodiza	Lepore	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter	
1546.001	Ms.	Lisa	Ramaci	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
1547.001	Ms.	Sharon	Goode	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
1548.000	Ms.	Bethal	Little	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1549.000	Mr.	Mark	Donaldson	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1550.000	Dr.	Sara	leonard	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1551.000	Ms.	Rio	Valencia	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1552.000	Mrs.	Mariola	Hienrich	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1553.000	Ms.	Sheila	Desmond	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1554.000	Ms.	Gina	Dahlstrom	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1555.000	Ms.	Julia	Frisk	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1556.000	Ms.	cindy	Klaus	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1557.000	Ms.	Katherine	Babiak	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1558.000	Mrs.	Sally	Giles	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1559.000	Mrs.	Ewa	Piasecka	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1560.000	Ms.	Maureen	Havey	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1561.000	Ms.	Bernadette	McGreevy	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1562.000	Ms.	Kathleen	Doyle	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1563.000	Mrs.	Rita	Raftery	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1564.000	Mrs.	Susan	Kollar	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1565.000	Ms.	Erin	Marko	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1566.000	Mr.	Mark	Skaret	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1567.000	Mr.	Joseph	Hoess	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1568.000	Ms.	Carolyn	Dennison	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1569.000	Ms.	Donna	Buscaemi	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1570.000	Ms.	Debra	Young	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1571.000	Mr.	Cristian Cortts	Morales	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1572.000	Ms.	Nancy J	Braun	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1573.000	Ms.	Margo	Morado	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1574.000	Ms.	Keeley	Harding	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1575.000	Ms.	Marti	Cooksey	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1576.000	Mr.	Peter	Cummins	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1577.000	Mrs.	Tatiana	Torres	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1578.000	Mrs.	Nelly	Lopez	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1579.000	Ms.	Liz	Reed	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1580.000	Ms.	Jeanie	Streit	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1581.000	Mr.	David	Councilman	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1582.000	Mr.	Warwick	Neal	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1583.000	Mrs.	Connie	Devine	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1584.000	Mr.	Austin	Boese	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1585.000	Ms.	Maricruz	Lopez	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1586.000	Mrs.	Ometh	Layton	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1587.000	Mr.	Rob	Burnett	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1588.000	Dr.	Deborah	Shaw, Ph.d.	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1589.000	Mrs.	Rocio	Salazar	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1590.000	Ms.	Joanne	Dickerson	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1591.000	Ms.	Kazue	Tanaka	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1592.000	Ms.	Elena	Chernysheva	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1593.000	Dr.	Kimberly	Wiley	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1594.000	Dr.	Kade	Ariani	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1595.000	Mrs.	Billita	Jacobsen	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1596.000	Ms.	Christeen	Anderson	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1597.000	Ms.	Claudia	Adamson	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1598.000	Mr.	Ken	Goldsmith	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1599.000	Ms.	Gretchen	Hanger	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1600.000	Mr.	Dennis	Woolley	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1601.000	Mrs.	Yvonne	Albrecht	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1602.000	Mr.	Michael	Jones	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1603.000	Mrs.	Shirley	Bensetler	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1604.000	Mr.	Ed	Vieira	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1605.000	Ms.	Marilyn	Ashman	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1606.000	Ms.	Rhonda	Carr	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1607.000	Mr.	Ben	Goodin	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1608.000	Ms.	Patricia	Carlton	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1609.000	Ms.	Alice	Bowron	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1610.000	Mr.	Dameon	Hansen	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1611.000	Mrs.	Jill	Cleveland	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1612.000	Ms.	Sylvia	Rabb	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1613.000	Mrs.	Susan	Krause	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1614.000	Mr.	John	Moszyk	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1615.000	Mrs.	Claudia	La Paglia	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1616.000	Ms.	Marlene	Puai	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1617.000	Mrs.	Christine	Roeffen	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1618.000	Mrs.	Gail	Cartwright	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1619.000	Ms.	Leslie G.	Baker	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1620.000	Miss	Jennifer	Miller	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1621.000	Mrs.	Linda	Ashton	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1622.000	Miss	Leticia	Kamada	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1623.000	Mr.	Victor	Excobar	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1624.000	Mr.	Thomas	Blaney	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1625.000	Ms.	Reisa	Gould-Donath	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1626.000	Mr.	Wm	Laestadius	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1627.000	Mr.	Julio L.	Ruiz	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1628.000	Ms.	Misty	Day	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1629.000	Mr.	Evelio	Pina	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1630.000	Mr.	John	Crotty	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1631.000	Miss	Katherine	Hinson	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1632.000	Mrs.	Norma	Laborie	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1633.000	Mrs.	Silvia	Granold	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1634.000	Mrs.	Jamie	Gomer	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1635.000	Ms.	Cindy	Massey	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1636.000	Ms.	C.	Himmelman	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1637.000	Mrs.	Carly	Steel	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1638.000	Mrs.	Mary	Richardson	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1639.000	Mrs.	Carla	Davis	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1640.000	Ms.	Judy	Albury	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1641.000	Mrs.	Jennifer	Bitschier	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1642.000	Ms.	Carol	Hollomon	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1643.000	Mrs.	Mary	Richardson	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1644.000	Miss	Amanda	Spalt	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1645.000	Mrs.	Jacqueline	Robinson	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1646.000	Mrs.	Mariette	Grobler	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1647.000	Mr.	Lawrence	Crowley	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1648.000	Ms.	Danuka	Radko	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1649.000	Mrs.	Barbara	Vieira	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1650.000	Miss	Meliss	Ebbing	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1651.000	Mr.	Paul	Ghenoiu	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1652.000	Ms.	Pamela	Spacek	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1653.000	Ms.	Sofie	Forsberg	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1654.000	Ms.	Roberta	Heist	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1655.000	Mr.	Thomas	Pintagro	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1656.000	Mr.	Samantha	Smolker	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1657.000	Mr.	Clifford	Provost	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1658.000	Dr.	Malcolm	MacPhenson, PhD	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1659.000	Miss	Sarah	Arnold	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1660.000	Miss	Emilia	Marquez	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1661.000	Ms.	Susan	Biggs	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1662.000	Ms.	Michelle	Anderson	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1663.000	Mr.	Ron	Sonnenberg	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1664.000	Ms.	Laura	Peck	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1665.000	Ms.	Stephanie	Trasoff	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1666.000	Ms.	Andrea	Gilbert	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1667.000	Mrs.	Anna	Louise E.	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1668.000	Mrs.	Catherine	Garneski	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1669.000	Mrs.	Patty	Kent	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1670.000	Ms.	Cinta	Curtis	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1671.000	Mrs.	Lourdes	Acevedo	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1672.000	Ms.	Victoria	Kleban	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1673.000	Mr.	Jeff	Widmer	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1674.000	Mr.	Brian	Kelly	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1675.000	Mrs.	Sonja	Malmuth	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1676.000	Mr.	James	Tyree II	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1677.000	Ms.	Phyllis	O'Reilly	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1678.000	Ms.	Melissa	Chitwood	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1679.000	Mr.	Shawn	Sargent	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1680.000	Mr.	Kyle	Hall	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1681.000	Ms.	M.	Hulburt	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1682.000	Ms.	Cara	Schmidt	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1683.000	Dr.	Pamela	Gilchirst	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1684.000	Ms.	Anna	Rennacker	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1685.000	Mr.	Karl	Feller	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1686.000	Miss	Desiree	Atkinson	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1687.000	Ms.	Karen	Kennedy	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1688.000	Mr.	Adam	Davis	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1689.000	Mrs.	Cecilia	Nakamura	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1690.000	Mr.	Barry	Kaufman	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1691.000	Mrs.	Judy	Bensinger	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
1692.000	Miss	Caryl	Pearson	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1693.000	Ms.	Deborah	Devore	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1694.000	Ms.	Janice	Westberry	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1695.000	Ms.	Karen	Debraal	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1696.000	Mr.	Paul	Antoniou	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1697.000	Mrs.	M. Neus	Tobella	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1698.000	Dr.	Christine	Wells	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1699.000	Mrs.	Setsuko	Maruki-Fox	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1700.000	Mr.	Steve	Ramirez	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1701.000	Mr.	Dominick	Saia	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1702.000	Ms.	Shelley	Frazier	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1703.000	Ms.	Samantha	Ruscavage-Barz	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1704.000	Ms.	Carolyn	Aranda	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1705.000	Mrs.	Daniela	Fraser	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1706.000	Mr.	Sviatoslav	Ivanenko	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1707.000	Mr.	Stan	Sheggeby	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1708.000	Ms.	Anna	Morris	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1709.000	Mr.	John	Richkus	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1710.000	Mrs.	Judy	Nordquist	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1711.000	Ms.	Aline	Rosenzweig	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
1712.000	Mr.	Philip	Perry	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1713.000	Mr.	Alex	Stavis	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1714.000	Mrs.	Lori Beth	Kidd	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1715.000	Ms.	Marisa	Morales	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1716.000	Mr.	Doug	Franklin	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1717.000	Ms.	Leslie	R.	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1718.000	Ms.	Tasha	Carpenter	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1719.000	Ms.	Tamara	Kreimerman	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1720.000	Mrs.	Teresa	Trucksess	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1721.000	Ms.	Margaret	Mueller	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1722.000	Ms.	Susan	Tarrant	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1723.000	Mrs.	Nathalie	Caiti	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1724.000	Mrs.	Carol	Becker	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1725.000	Ms.	Helen	Briner	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1726.000	Ms.	Amanda	McNeill	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1727.000	Miss	Elzbieta	Beck	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1728.000	Mrs.	Jessica	McGratty	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1729.000	Ms.	Sarah	Biggers	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1730.000	Mrs.	Dori	Grasso	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1731.000	Mrs.	Tanya, Sean, Tiegan, Samara	MacRae	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1732.000	Ms.	Claudia	Lozano	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1733.000	Ms.	Brenda	Robertson	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1734.000	Mr.	David	Bewley	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1735.000	Ms.	Rachael	Pappano	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1736.000	Ms.	Frances	Marcolli	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1737.000	Ms.	Carol	Wiley	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1738.000	Ms.	Gtradline	Crapuche	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1739.000	Mrs.	Susan	Bechtholt	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1740.000	Mrs.	Barbara	Versluis	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1741.000	Mrs.	Dini	Schipper	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1742.000	Mr.	John	Scahill	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1743.000	Ms.	Debra	Singer	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1744.000	Mr.	Joe	Zakes	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1745.000	Ms.	Patricia	Randazzo	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1746.000	Mr.	Luis	Fuentes	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1747.000	Mr.	Ben Oscar	Andersson	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1748.000	Mrs.	Susan	Dunaway	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1749.000	Ms.	Patricia	Vineski	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1750.000	Ms.	Sally	Barucchieri	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1751.000	Mr.	Donald	Vickers	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1752.000	Ms.	Sarah	Clarke	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1753.000	Mr.	Christine	Frost	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1754.000	Mr.	Theodore	Brazeau	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1755.000	Ms.	Sherry	Lewis	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1756.000	Ms.	Glenna	Waterman	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1757.000	Ms.	Lorraine	Segedin	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1758.000	Mr.	Duane	Baker	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1759.000	Miss	Ellen	Gutfleisch	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1760.000	Mrs.	Kathy	Alter	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1761.000	Mr.	Neil	Hastings	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1762.000	Ms.	Lisa	MacLean	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1763.000	Mrs.	Ilse	Hadda	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1764.000	Mr.	Jules	Jain	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1765.000	Ms.	Carol	Weaver	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1766.000	Mr.	Kim	Bauer	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1767.000	Mrs.	Louise	Dahlgren	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1768.000	Mr.	Erma	Lewis	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1769.000	Miss	Connie	Oglesby	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1770.000	Dr.	Alan	Kardoff	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1771.000	Mr.	David	Sheets	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1772.000	Ms.	Deborah	Hirsch	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1773.000	Ms.	Paula	Propst	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1774.000	Mr.	Aaron	Bouchard	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1775.000	Mr.	Mark	Mansfield	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1776.000	Ms.	Mireille	Picron	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1777.000	Ms.	Janet	Moncure	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
1778.000	Ms.	Heather	Hundt	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1779.000	Mr.	William	Dearstyne	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1780.000	Ms.	Salme	Armijo	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1781.000	Ms.	Phoenix	Vie	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1782.000	Ms.	Tracey	MacDermott	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1783.000	Ms.	Sue	Hutch	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1784.000	Mrs.	Elke	Romer	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1785.000	Ms.	Sonia	Hernandez	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1786.000	Ms.	Geneva	Wilson	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1787.000	Mrs.	Isabelita	Lesmana	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1788.000	Ms.	Leslie	Hamlin	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1789.000	Mrs.	Erin	Barca	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1790.000	Mrs.	Cathy	Winsor	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1791.000	Ms.	D.	Crosmun	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1792.000	Miss	Claudia	Fuchs	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1793.000	Ms.	Sharon	Lee	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
1794.000	Mrs.	Dianna	Posner	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1795.000	Ms.	Sheryl	Bottner	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1796.000	Mrs.	Susan	Termini	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1797.000	Ms.	Sandra	Cobb	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1798.000	Miss	Ana	Lopes	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1799.000	Mr.	Pierre	Vanderhoeft	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1800.000	Mrs.	Arianna	Dutter	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1801.000	Ms.	Dawn	O'Donnell	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1802.000	Ms.	Mae	Newcombe	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1803.000	Mrs.	Nancy	Gates	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1804.000	Mr.	Gerard	van Tol	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1805.000	Ms.	Danuta	Watola	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1806.000	Ms.	Patty	Powell	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1807.000	Mr.	Thomas	Kane	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1808.000	Mr.	David	Laing	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1809.000	Mrs.	Maud	Van Tol	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1810.000	Ms.	Mary	Walishko	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1811.000	Mrs.	Chris	Schneebeli	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
1812.000	Ms.	Lisa	Graham	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1813.000	Mrs.	Jen	Jensoasis	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1814.000	Mr.	Jeffrey	Freilich	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1815.000	Ms.	Sarah	Gann	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1816.000	Mr.	Tom	Tree	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1817.000	Mrs.	Debbie	Kirkbride	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1818.000	Mr.	Jean	Phillips-Calapai	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1819.000	Ms.	Susan	Lefler	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1820.000	Mr.	Yves	Garin	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1821.000	Mr.	Larry	Olivier	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1822.000	Ms.	Kate	Kenner	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1823.000	Mrs.	Uta	Cortimilia	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1824.000	Mr.	Dana	Bleckinger	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1825.000	Mrs.	Jane	Rita	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1826.000	Ms.	Ali	Van Zee	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1827.000	Ms.	Kimberly	Hurt	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1828.000		Sally	Planalp	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1829.000	Ms.	Natalia	Miramontes	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1830.000	Ms.	Sally	Sorensen	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1831.000	Mr.	Steven	Kostis	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1832.000	Ms.	Norma	Campbell	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1833.000	Dr.	Sally	Hodson	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1834.000	Ms.	Margaret	Lenahan	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1835.000	Mr.	Dameon	Torrey	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1836.000	Mr.	William	Ryerson	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1837.000	Ms.	Kathy	Haverkamp	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1838.000	Ms.	Sabine	Hoelzel	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1839.000	Mrs.	Lucienne	Westra	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1840.000	Mrs.	Juliet	Pearson	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1841.000	Ms.	Pam	Lynn	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1842.000	Ms.	Sarah	Ganong	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1843.000	Ms.	Linda	Phelan	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1844.000		Brian	Kreimendahi	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
1845.000	Ms.	Beth	Copanos	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1846.000	Mrs.	Purnima	Barve	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1847.000	Dr.	George	Pauk	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1848.000	Ms.	Dru Ann	Delgado	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1849.000	Mr.	Rolf	Sorensen	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1850.000	Ms.	Daniela	Rossi	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1851.000	Mr.	Brian & Marion	Jones	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1852.000	Mrs.	Rebecca	Hessinger	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1853.000	Ms.	Yvonne	Pratt	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1854.000	Mrs.	Alexandra	Meyer	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1855.000	Ms.	Katariina	Rantala	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1856.000	Ms.	Ashley	Schutt	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1857.000	Mr.	Dogan	Ozkan	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1858.000	Ms.	Judith	Platz	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1859.000	Miss	Liron	Solomon	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1860.000	Mrs.	Dana	Kubiak	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1861.000	Ms.	Donna	Hamilton	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1862.000	Ms.	Angela	Brooke-Ward	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1863.000	Mrs.	Patricia	Chang	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1864.000	Mr.	Frans	Badenhorst	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1865.000		Bodil	Ribel	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1866.000	Mr.	Thomas	Rummel	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
1867.000	Ms.	Linda	Mooney	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1868.000	Ms.	Amy	Perrin	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1869.000	Mr.	Eric	Voorhies	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1870.000	Mr.	Ortwin	Mergner	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1871.000	Mr.	John	Montgomery	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1872.000	Mrs.	Barbara	Lowden	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1873.000	Mr.	Gary	Weaver	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1874.000	Mr.	Joe	Renneke	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1875.000	Miss	Misa	Cajnko	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1876.000	Mrs.	Antina	Schmidt	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1877.000	Dr.	Kari	Wilson	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1878.000	Ms.	Sofia	Almanza	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1879.000	Ms.	Christiane	Henker	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1880.000	Mr.	Ron	Deters	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1881.000	Ms.	Lorraine	Barrie	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1882.000	Ms.	Karen	Chestney	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1883.000	Mr.	Jaime	Rosado	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1884.000	Ms.	Michelle	Abouchabki	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1885.000	Mrs.	Gabriela	Bernreuther	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1886.000	Ms.	Lisa	Daloia	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1887.000	Mr.	Greg	Amour	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1888.000	Mrs.	Ann	Kasperski	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1889.000	Ms.	Marlena	Lange	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1890.000	Mr.	Silvia	Bertano	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1891.000	Ms.	Jennifer	Lowans	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1892.000	Mr.	James	Moffitt	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1893.000	Ms.	Sabrina	Burrows	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1894.000	Mrs.	Anne	Roberts	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1895.000	Mr.	John	Hammel	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1896.000	Mrs.	Shirley	Warren	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1897.000		Paola	Scodellari	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1898.000	Mr.	Richard	Heinlein	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1899.000	Ms.	Anne	Miettinen	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1900.000	Ms.	Maryellen	Redish	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
1901.000	Ms.	Kathy	Lawless	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1902.000	Ms.	Saliane	Anderssen	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1903.000	Mr.	Jim	Sennett	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1904.000	Ms.	Lesley	Blissett	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1905.000	Ms.	Monique	Parisius	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1906.000	Ms.	Kristin	Erman	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1907.000	Mrs.	Nina	Gondos	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1908.000	Ms.	Mariela	Barraza	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1909.000	Ms.	Whitney	Metz	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1910.000	Mr.	Bruno	Prata	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1911.000	Mr.	Richie	Kessler	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1912.000	Mr.	Christopher	Sego	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1913.000	Ms.	Alexia	Nunn	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1914.000	Mr.	Chris	Redston	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1915.000	Mr.	Joseph	Kostenko	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
1916.000	Mr.	Art	Hanson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
1917.000	Mrs.	Natalie	Hanson	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1918.000	Mrs.	Jacki	Hileman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
1919.000	Mrs.	Anna	Factor	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
1920.000	Mrs.	Carol	Cramer	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1921.000	Ms.	Bettina	Bickel	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1922.000	Mr.	Andreas	Vlasiadis	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1923.000	Ms.	Florence	Harty	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1924.000	Ms.	Sharon	Bodman	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1925.000	Ms.	Anne	Bodin	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1926.000	Mr.	Jason	Altman	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1927.000	Mrs.	Jennifer	Warrow	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1928.000	Mrs.	Barbara	McIntosh	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1929.000	Mrs.	Susan	Watts	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1930.000		Kathy	Meteraud	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1931.000	Mr.	Marcos	Carrillo	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1932.000	Ms.	Rita	Guidi	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1933.000	Miss	Dalila	Ouai	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1934.000	Mrs.	Nancy	Cook	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1935.000	Ms.	Sharon	Bodman	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1936.000	Mrs.	Marleen	Neus	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1937.000	Ms.	Nyack	Clancy	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1938.000	Mr.	James H.	Fitch	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1939.000	Ms.	Zoe	Harris	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1940.000	Ms.	Shemayim	Elohim	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1941.000	Mr.	Eyad	Alhumaidan	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1942.000	Ms.	Terresa	Hammond	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1943.000	Mr.	Grant	Campbell	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1944.000	Mr.	Arnold	Ruiz	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1945.000	Miss	Laurel	Brewer	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1946.000	Mr.	Robert	Krikourian	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1947.000	Mr.	Jens	Warrntjen	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1948.000	Mrs.	Erin	Lindquist	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1949.000	Mrs.	Heike	Feldmann	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1950.000	Mr.	Chris	Carlon	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1951.000	Ms.	Leslie	Schriener	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1952.000	Mr.	Ronald	Maxson	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1953.000	Mr.	William	Farmoon	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1954.000	Ms.	Maya	Kurtz	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1955.000	Dr.	Robert	Miller	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1956.000		Verona	Petrou	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1957.000	Mr.	Jason	Bowman	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1958.000	Mr.	Robert	Droeszler	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1959.000	Mr.	Michel	Collin	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1960.000	Mrs.	Kathryn	Richardson	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1961.000	Mr.	Douglas	Wagoner	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1962.000	Mr.	Ismail	Al Ahmad	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1963.000	Ms.	Juliet	Ostoich	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1964.000	Ms.	Peggy	Powell	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1965.000	Ms.	Mary	Ferraro	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1966.000	Ms.	Stephanie	Voss	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1967.000	Mr.	Marc	Silverglade	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
1968.000	Mrs.	A.	F.	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1969.000	Ms.	Sybille	Castro	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1970.000	Mr.	Franklin	Platizky	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1971.000	Ms.	Maria	White	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1972.000	Mr.	George	Pavlinos	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1973.000	Mr.	Jeff	Hopkins	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1974.000	Ms.	Cami	Leonard	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1975.000	Ms.	Linda Ann	Reynolds, Ed.s.	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1976.000	Miss	Asli	Gedik	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1977.000	Ms.	Heli	Persls	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1978.000	Mrs.	Naoko	Miz	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
1979.000	Mrs.	Diane	Ethridge	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
1980.000	Dr.	William	Schmonsees	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
1981.000	Miss	Amy	Dozier	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
1982.000	Miss	Anamaria	Torres	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
1983.000	Ms.	Dee	Warenycia	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
1984.000	Mrs.	Ai	McCarthy	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
1985.000	Ms.	Crystal	Harty	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
1986.000	Mr.	Richard	Puai	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
1987.000	Mr.	Steve	McAthur	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
1988.000	Ms.	Judith	Busse	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
1989.000	Ms.	Michelle	MacKenzie	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
1990.000	Ms.	Sherrie	Ferris	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
1991.000		Jana	McKeeman	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
1992.000	Ms.	Wanda	Ballentine	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
1993.000	Ms.	Nancy	Hartman	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
1994.000	Ms.	Gladys	Rhoads	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
1995.000	Ms.	Denise J.	Tartaglia	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
1996.000	Ms.	Bonnie	Faith	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
1997.000	Ms.	Lizabeth	Johnson	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
1998.000	Ms.	Ilene	Kazak	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
1999.000	Ms.	Christine	Marquette	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2000.000	Ms.	Mary	Tindukasiri	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2001.000	Ms.	Jann	Webb	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2002.000	Ms.	Sondra	Boss	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2003.000	Ms.	Kathleen	Wolfe	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2004.000	Mr.	Gregory	Kendall	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2005.000	Ms.	J	Stufflebeam	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2006.000	Miss	Josie	Ravenwolf	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2007.000	Mr.	Luke	Asbury	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2008.000	Mrs.	Mary Jo	Masters	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2009.000	Ms.	Marcia	Salmond	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2010.000	Mr.	Ken	Ward, Jr	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2011.000	Dr.	Pat	Bryan	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2012.000	Ms.	Arifa	Goodman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2013.000	Mr.	Thomas	Gorman	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2014.000	Miss	Deborah	Lancman	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2015.000	Mr.	Ed	Abdool	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2016.000		Stacie	Wooley	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2017.000	Mr.	Peter	Kahigian	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2018.000	Mrs.	Marilyn	Saunders	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2019.000	Dr.	Christianna	Skoczek	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2020.000	Ms.	Candy	Bowman	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2021.000	Ms.	Lisa	Framiglio	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2022.000	Ms.	Georje	Holper	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2023.000	Mr.	John	Pinezich	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2024.000	Mrs.	Cecilia	Pipetone-Oliveto	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2025.000	Ms.	Deniz	Bolbol	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2026.000	Dr.	Ralph	Maughan	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2027.000	Ms.	Robin	Down	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2028.000	Ms.	Cheryl	Fisher	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2029.000		Sherry	Bailey	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2030.000	Ms.	Christine	B.	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2031.000	Ms.	Linda Ann	Petrulias	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2032.000	Mr.	Jan	Kochmeister	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2033.000	Mr.	Glen	Benjamin	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2034.000	Mr.	Gregory	Rosas	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2035.000	Ms.	Sharma	Gaponoff	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2036.000	Mrs.	Adeltraud	Homer	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter	
2037.000	Ms.	Lynn	Morris	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2038.000	Mr.	Steve	Tyler	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
2039.000	Mrs.	Joanne	Mack	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter	
2040.000	Ms.	Karen	Guisse	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2041.000	Mr.	Randy	Sailer	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2042.000	Ms.	Amanda	Milster	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2043.000	Ms.	Karla	Devine	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2044.000	Mrs.	Margaret	Franklin	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2045.000	Ms.	Sharon	Poessel	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2046.000	Ms.	Annette	Pieniasek	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2047.000	Mr.	Kevin	Hughes	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2048.000	Ms.	Rosemarie	Sawdon	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2049.000	Mrs.	Linda Ann	Yancey	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2050.000	Ms.	Elaine	Jurumbo	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2051.000	Mr.	Dan	Schneider	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2052.000	Ms.	Elizabeth	Eisner	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2053.000	Mr.	Beau	Chaîne'	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2054.000	Ms.	Anita	Stuckey	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2055.000		Brenda	Morris	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2056.000	Mr.	Stephen	Bellomo	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2057.000	Mr.	Donald	Schwartz	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2058.000	Ms.	Keeta	Beaubien	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2059.000	Ms.	Linda	Laddin	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2060.000	Ms.	Maureen	O'Neal	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2061.000	Ms.	Susan	Nierenberg	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2062.000	Dr.	Marc and Jill	Klosner	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2063.000	Mrs.	Vickey	Baker	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2064.000	Mr.	Franklin	Scanzillo	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2065.000	Mr.	Robert	Ellis	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2066.000	Mr.	Albert	Tahhan	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2067.000	Mr.	John	Meeks	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2068.000		Anita	Goncalves	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2069.000	Ms.	Kristin	Rall	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2070.000	Mr.	Jeffrey	McCollim	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2071.000	Ms.	Lesley	Schultz	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2072.000	Ms.	Judith E.	Scott	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2073.000	Ms.	Misty	McIntyre	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2074.000	Ms.	Katherine	Rabenau	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2075.000	Mr.	Matt	Johnson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2076.000	Mr.	Jim	May	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2077.000	Mr.	Joseph	Bateman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2078.000	Ms.	Donna	Knipp	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2079.000	Ms.	Mandy	Spitzer	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2080.000	Ms.	Charlene	Rush	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2081.000		Joanne	Robrahn	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2082.000	Mr.	Jack	Stansfield	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2083.000	Mr.	William	Davidson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2084.000	Mr.	Timothy	Lauxmann	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2085.000	Miss	Jacqueline	Newman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2086.000	Ms.	Janis	Tilton	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2087.000	Mrs.	Dale	Lacognata	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2088.000	Mrs.	Patricia	Vazquez	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2089.000	Mr.	Loren	Lugg	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2090.000	Ms.	Jo	Conaty	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2091.000	Ms.	Beverly	Lane	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2092.000	Dr.	William	Mader, Phd	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2093.000	Ms.	Andrea	Padr	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2094.000		Andre	Cavalier	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2095.000	Miss	Adobe	House	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2096.000	Mr.	R.	Belsher	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2097.000	Ms.	Sheila	Sheppard	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2098.000	Mr.	Chris	Palmaro	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2099.000	Ms.	Myra	Moglowski	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2100.000	Ms.	Linda	Ricks	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2101.000	Ms.	Linette	Schreiber	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2102.000	Ms.	Jeannine	Barrett	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2103.000	Mrs.	Joyce	Overton	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2104.000	Mrs.	Dorothy	Chamberlin	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2105.000	Ms.	Kay	Steinauer	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2106.000	Miss	Michelle	Parsons	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2107.000	Mr.	William	Toner	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2108.000	Ms.	Charlotte	Sines	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2109.000	Ms.	Isa	Luerssen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2110.000	Ms.	Sharon	Stockman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2111.000	Mr.	Mike	Hansen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2112.000	Mr.	Samuel	Durkin	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2113.000	Ms.	Judith	Meek	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2114.000	Ms.	Dawn	Albanese	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2115.000	Mr.	Lance	Kammerud	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2116.000	Mr.	Chris	Toye	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2117.000	Ms.	Lori	Hawkins	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2118.000	Mr.	Lee	Whitehall	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2119.000	Mr.	Kevin	Garrity	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2120.000	Ms.	Donna	Davis	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2121.000	Mr.	Gary	Yeomans	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2122.000	Mr.	Edward	Bour	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2123.000	Ms.	Betsy	Ridge	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2124.000	Ms.	Katherine	Blagden	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2125.000	Mrs.	Diane	Pease	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2126.000	Mrs.	Pamela	Turick	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2127.000	Ms.	Barbara	Stamp	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2128.000	Ms.	Hannah	Freed	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2129.000		Nzingha	Masani-Manuel	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2130.000	Miss	Michele	Martinez	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2131.000	Ms.	Michaela	Niermann	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2132.000	Ms.	Eileen	Crowe	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2133.000	Ms.	Barbara	Gibson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2134.000	Ms.	Elke	Passarge	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2135.000	Ms.	Kathleen	Brady	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2136.000	Ms.	Linda	Smyth	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2137.000	Mrs.	P.	Nunez	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2138.000	Mr.	Dana	Bleckinger	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2139.000	Mrs.	Jeannine	Taylor	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2140.000	Mr.	Rob	Troutman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2141.000	Mr.	Eliza	Solesby	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2142.000	Ms.	Valerie	Romero	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2143.000	Dr.	Phil	James	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2144.000	Ms.	Lorelei	Stierlen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2145.000	Mr.	John	Varga	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2146.000	Ms.	Gail	McMullen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2147.000	Ms.	Jenette	D'alessandro	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2148.000	Ms.	Rosemary	Griffith	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2149.000	Ms.	Cam	Krosn	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2150.000	Mr.	Wayne	Flick	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2151.000	Ms.	Patty	Kowalczyk	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2152.000	Mr.	Steve	Lucas	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2153.000	Ms.	Christine	Canavan	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2154.000	Miss	Brandi	McCauley	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2155.000	Mr.	Jorge	De Cecco	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2156.000	Mrs.	Christen	Morris	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2157.000	Mr.	Kelly	Quinn	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2158.000	Ms.	Elisa	Gonzalez	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2159.000	Ms.	Ivana	Santos	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2160.000	Mr.	Randall	Nerwick	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2161.000	Mrs.	Mandy	Hanifen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2162.000	Ms.	Nicole	Sears	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2163.000	Mrs.	Myra	Berario	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2164.000	Ms.	Mary	Beckman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2165.000	Ms.	Rebecca	Taylor	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2166.000	Ms.	Paula	Xiberras	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2167.000	Ms.	Laurel	Covington	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2168.000	Ms.	Shahn	Donegan	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2169.000	Mr.	Marc	Draper	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2170.000	Ms.	Ann	Bicking	WildEarth Guardians	6/23/2014	same form letter	
2171.000	Ms.	Tia	Pearson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2172.000	Dr.	Barry	Logan	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2173.000	Mr.	Jared	Cornelia	WildEarth Guardians	6/23/2014	same form letter	
2174.000	Ms.	Cynthia	Sherman-Jones	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2175.000	Mr.	Eric	Meyer	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2176.000	Ms.	Lenore	Reeves	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2177.000		Pat	Mimeau	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2178.000	Mr.	Jimmy	Tolson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2179.000	Mr.	Richard	Spas	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2180.000	Ms.	Hope	Schnee	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2181.000	Mr.	Clifford	Hritz	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2182.000	Mrs.	Maria	Jackson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2183.000	Ms.	Robin	Hirsch	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2184.000	Ms.	Elizabeth	O'nan	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2185.000	Mr.	Robert	Steininger	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2186.000	Miss	Lauren	Wade	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2187.000	Mrs.	Paulett	Simunich	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2188.000	Mr.	Eric	Jones	WildEarth Guardians	6/23/2014	same form letter	
2189.000	Ms.	Brianne	Helaudais	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2190.000	Ms.	Ginny	Brommelsick	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2191.000	Dr.	Julie	Martenson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2192.000	Mr.	David	Ulibarri	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2193.000	Ms.	Catherine	Griffin	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2194.000	Mr.	Douglas	Beall	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2195.000	Mrs.	Julia	Faber	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2196.000	Mr.	Robert	Thornhill	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2197.000	Mr.	Todd	Wilson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2198.000	Mrs.	Sara	Carroll	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2199.000	Ms.	Janice	Mackanic	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2200.000	Mr.	Ken	Martin	WildEarth Guardians	6/23/2014	same form letter	
2201.000	Mrs.	Janet	Chase	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2202.000	Ms.	Janis	Kinslow	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2203.000	Mr.	Presley	Garrett	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2204.000	Miss	Amy	Hansen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2205.000	Ms.	Crystal	Schuh	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2206.000	Mr.	Ernie	Looney	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2207.000	Dr.	Somdev	Bhattacharji	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2208.000	Mr.	John and Jean	Fleming	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2209.000	Ms.	Cynthia	Lambert	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2210.000	Ms.	Croitene	Ganmoryn	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2211.000	Dr.	V	Evan	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2212.000	Mrs.	Dorothy	Parshall	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2213.000	Miss	Erika	Mohos	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2214.000	Mr.	Steven	Kranowski	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2215.000	Mr.	Christopher	Dowling	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2216.000	Ms.	Bonnie	Hearthstone	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2217.000	Ms.	Sybil	Schlesinger	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2218.000	Ms.	Ann	Kelly	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2219.000	Ms.	Alexis	Nixon	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2220.000	Mr.	Bob	Sipe	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2221.000	Ms.	Angela	Bailey	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2222.000	Ms.	Dominique	Renucci	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2223.000	Mr.	James	Berkheimer	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2224.000	Ms.	Kim	Powanda	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2225.000	Ms.	Bea	Baxter	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2226.000	Ms.	Katherine	Garbrick	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2227.000	Ms.	Lori	Colt	WildEarth Guardians	6/23/2014	same form letter	
2228.000	Mr.	John	Dunn	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2229.000	Ms.	Briggid	Larson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2230.000	Mr.	Joel	Bown	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2231.000	Ms.	Sally	Stansill	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2232.000	Mrs.	Nelly	Valla	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2233.000	Mrs.	Maria Rosaria	Bruscia	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2234.000	Mrs.	Cara Lynn	Pugh	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2235.000	Ms.	Carol	Held	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2236.000	Dr.	Heide	Coppotelli	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2237.000	Ms.	Mary	Caperilla	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2238.000	Ms.	Marianna	Sokol	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2239.000	Mr.	Javier	Mendez	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2240.000	Ms.	Lisa	Vandermay	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2241.000	Dr.	Dm	Funk	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2242.000	Mr.	Frederick	Jackson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2243.000	Mrs.	Monique	Tonet	WildEarth Guardians	6/23/2014	same form letter	
2244.000	Ms.	Judy	Wenning	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2245.000	Mrs.	Jody	Gibson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2246.000	Mr.	Marty	Bostic	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2247.000	Ms.	Janet	Rutigliano	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2248.000	Mrs.	Denise	Kastner	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2249.000		G M		WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2250.000	Mr.	Carroll	Munz	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2251.000	Dr.	Henry	Weinberg	WildEarth Guardians	6/23/2014	same form letter	
2252.000	Ms.	Catherine	Dietrich	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2253.000	Mrs.	Marie	Jones	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2254.000	Mr.	Ken	Canty	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2255.000	Ms.	Ginger	Brewer	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2256.000	Mrs.	Sharon	Moreno	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2257.000	Mrs.	Anita	Cartwright	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2258.000	Mr.	Mark	Gillono	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2259.000	Mr.	Scott	Coahran	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2260.000	Ms.	Tonya	Foster	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2261.000	Mr.	Raymond	Keeling	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2262.000	Mr.	Alessandro	Ciccarelli	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2263.000	Mr.	Mark	Caskey	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2264.000	Ms.	Peg	Nicholson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2265.000	Dr.	Pamela	Laham	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2266.000	Ms.	Helen	Logan Hays	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2267.000	Ms.	Av	Harville	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2268.000	Mr.	Mauricio	Carvajal	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2269.000	Mr.	Jason	Grace	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2270.000	Mr.	Ryan	Mcculloch	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2271.000	Ms.	Denise	Thomas	WildEarth Guardians	6/23/2014	same form letter	
2272.000	Ms.	Ellen	Middleditch	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2273.000		Keli	Myers	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2274.000	Mrs.	Alexis	Negele	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2275.000	Mrs.	Donna	Selquist	WildEarth Guardians	6/23/2014	same form letter	
2276.000	Dr.	Brooks	Obr	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2277.000	Ms.	Gloria	Sall	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2278.000	Mr.	John	Pasqua	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2279.000	Ms.	Joan	Squires	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2280.000	Ms.	Adrienne	Ross	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2281.000	Miss	Liu	Wai Ling	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2282.000	Ms.	Meredith	Green	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2283.000	Mr.	Joel	Perkins	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2284.000	Mr.	Doug	Krause	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2285.000	Ms.	Maria Ines	Molina	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2286.000	Mrs.	Sandra	Chu	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2287.000	Ms.	Sharon	Nicodemus	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2288.000	Ms.	Barbara	Huggins	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2289.000	Ms.	Keli	Hendricks	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2290.000	Ms.	Leslie	Cassidy	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2291.000	Ms.	Diane	Hejl	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2292.000	Mrs.	Hester	Goedhart	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2293.000	Ms.	Loralei	Matisse	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2294.000	Mrs.	Holly	Dowling	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2295.000	Mr.	Sebastien	Vigne	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2296.000	Ms.	Beth	MacDonald	WildEarth Guardians	6/23/2014	same form letter	
2297.000	Dr.	Pauline	Erera	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2298.000	Ms.	Ingeborg	Glier	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2299.000	Mrs.	Bonnie	Mandell Rice	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2300.000	Mr.	Lance	Kammerud	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2301.000	Mrs.	Aimee	Arceo	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2302.000	Mr.	Steve	Sheehy	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2303.000	Mr.	Joel	Meza	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2304.000	Mr.	Rollin	Blanton	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2305.000	Ms.	AniMaeChi	Drabic	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2306.000	Ms.	Lisa	Clark-Kahn	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2307.000	Mr.	Craig	Martin	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2308.000	Ms.	Louise	Wallace	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2309.000	Mr.	James	Wolcott	WildEarth Guardians	6/23/2014	same form letter	
2310.000	Ms.	Colleen	Mcglone	WildEarth Guardians	6/23/2014	same form letter	
2311.000	Ms.	Yazmin	Gonzalez	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2312.000	Mr.	Jake	Wolfhart	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2313.000	Ms.	Patricia	Nazzaro	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2314.000	Ms.	Kathleen	Hollingsworth	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2315.000	Ms.	Katherine	Connor McKee	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2316.000	Mrs.	Diane	Carson-Huff	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2317.000	Mr.	Bayard	Mentrum	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2318.000	Ms.	Stacey	Calvert	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2319.000	Ms.	M	s	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2320.000	Mrs.	Jeanne	Held-Warmkessel	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2321.000	Mrs.	Melanie	Weberg	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2322.000	Mr.	Peter	Boxall	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2323.000	Mr.	Diego	Ruiz	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2324.000	Ms.	Carol	Shelton	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2325.000	Ms.	Kathy	Bergquist	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2326.000	Ms.	Lynne	Pateman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2327.000	Ms.	Linda	Prince	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2328.000	Mr.	Herb	Allenson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2329.000	Mr.	Thomas	Petencin	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2330.000	Miss	Tracey	Mangus	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2331.000	Ms.	Barbara	Freischlad	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2332.000	Ms.	Lynne	Oulman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2333.000	Mr.	Robert	Phillips	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2334.000	Ms.	Tazuko	Ichikawa	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2335.000	Ms.	Jelica	Roland	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2336.000	Mrs.	Joy	Mamoyac	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2337.000	Ms.	Jennifer	Hayes	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2338.000	Mr.	George	Heritier	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2339.000	Mr.	Russel	Deroche	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2340.000	Ms.	Elisa	Townshend	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2341.000	Mr.	Bruce	Papier	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2342.000	Ms.	Diane	Kraft	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2343.000	Mr.	Steve	Griffith	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2344.000	Ms.	Camille	Gilbert	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2345.000	Mr.	Douglas	Ward	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2346.000	Mrs.	Hera	Gerber	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2347.000	Ms.	Adela	Milla	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2348.000	Ms.	Candy	LeBlanc	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2349.000	Ms.	Doreen	McElvany	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2350.000	Mr.	Mike	Brown	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2351.000	Mr.	Jess	Graffell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2352.000	Mr.	Prem	Mulberry	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2353.000	Ms.	Lynne	Elliott	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2354.000	Ms.	Camille	Caldwell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2355.000	Ms.	Ann	Ruthsdottir	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2356.000	Ms.	Felicia	Williams	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2357.000	Mr.	Barrett	Goldflies	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2358.000	Ms.	Frances	Harriman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2359.000	Mr.	Thomas	Linell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2360.000	Mrs.	Jana	Pruse	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2361.000	Mrs.	Britt	Lind	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2362.000	Ms.	Patricia	Mccain	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2363.000	Mrs.	Lorraine	Grasso	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2364.000	Mr.	John	Hill	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2365.000	Ms.	Lydia	Garvey	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2366.000	Ms.	Gloria	Shen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2367.000	Ms.	Kim	Kokett	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2368.000	Ms.	Miranda	Leiva	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2369.000	Ms.	Jane	Young	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2370.000	Dr.	Daniel	Harris	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2371.000	Mr.	Eric	Zakin	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2372.000	Mr.	Jon	Barlow Hudson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2373.000	Ms.	Jahnavi	Stenflo	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2374.000	Ms.	Connie	Raper	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2375.000	Mr.	Dennis	Nolan	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2376.000	Mr.	Kevin	O'rouke	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2377.000	Mrs.	Julie	Sasaoka	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2378.000	Mr.	Chittaranjan	Reddy	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2379.000	Ms.	Shannan	Johnson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2380.000	Mrs.	Mary	Truelove	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2381.000		Drew	Martin	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2382.000	Ms.	Deborah	Dahlgren	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2383.000	Mr.	Michael	Guest	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2384.000	Dr.	Alicia	Jackson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2385.000	Miss	Jennifer	Cunningham	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2386.000	Mrs.	Adelina	Jaudal	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2387.000	Ms.	Nora	Regan	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2388.000	Mr.	Jose	De Arteaga	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2389.000	Dr.	G Blu	Wagner	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2390.000	Ms.	Debbie	Biere	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2391.000	Dr.	Ken	Gibb	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2392.000	Mrs.	Gail	Roberts	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2393.000	Ms.	Mikki	Chalker	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2394.000	Mrs.	Claudia	Miranda	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2395.000	Ms.	Christine	Brazis	WildEarth Guardians	6/23/2014	same form letter	
2396.000	Mr.	Jay	Mulberry	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2397.000	Mrs.	Cathy	Williams	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2398.000				WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2399.000	Mrs.	Shirley	White	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2400.000	Mr.	William	Mitchell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2401.000	Mrs.	Iva	Zafirovska	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2402.000	Mr.	Douglas	Sedon	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2403.000	Ms.	Kathy	Spinks	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2404.000	Mr.	Edward	Mrkvicka	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2405.000	Ms.	Natalie	Jaime	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2406.000	Mrs.	Debra	Muller-Harris	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2407.000	Mrs.	Heidi	Ludwick	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2408.000	Ms.	Natasha	Salgado	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2409.000	Ms.	Adrienne	Simoneau	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2410.000	Dr.	Janet	Maker	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2411.000	Ms.	Barbara	Matthews	WildEarth Guardians	6/23/2014	same form letter	
2412.000	Ms.	Kathy	Nix	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2413.000	Mr.	D'Arcy	Bruderer	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2414.000	Mr.	Jeffrey	Bains	WildEarth Guardians	6/23/2014	same form letter	
2415.000	Mrs.	Shirley	Smith	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2416.000	Mrs.	Janet	Mccalister	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2417.000	Mrs.	Betti	Jones	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2418.000	Mr.	Linda	Drescher	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2419.000	Mrs.	Diana	Keyser	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2420.000	Ms.	Jane	Perry	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2421.000	Mr.	Wiktor	Ostasz	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2422.000	Ms.	Nancy	Peterson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2423.000	Mrs.	Suesie	Hartman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2424.000	Mr.	Charles	Hall	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2425.000	Mrs.	Linda	Morero	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2426.000	Mr.	Ivar C.	Fossen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2427.000	Mr.	Keefe	Nghe	WildEarth Guardians	6/23/2014	same form letter	
2428.000	Mr.	Michael	Stewart	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2429.000	Ms.	Grace	Neff	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2430.000	Mr.	Charles	Stup	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2431.000	Dr.	George	Lewis	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2432.000	Ms.	Elizabeth	Kelson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2433.000	Mrs.	Dorothy	Stoner	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2434.000	Mr.	George	Grace	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2435.000	Ms.	Cindy	Marvin	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2436.000	Ms.	Midge	Tuley	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2437.000	Ms.	Toni	Mccalley	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2438.000	Ms.	Tara	Verbridge	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2439.000	Mr.	Bruce	Jenkinson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2440.000	Ms.	Judy	Jones	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2441.000	Ms.	Paula	Hartgraves	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2442.000	Mrs.	Capri	Sims	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Same form letter	
2443.000	Mrs.	Carol	White	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2444.000	Mrs.	Donna	Towne		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2445.000	Mr.	Darren	Mitton		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2446.000	Mrs.	Michele	Tritscher		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2447.000	Ms.	Barbara	Mintz		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2448.000	Ms.	Elizabeth	Hayward		6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2449.000	Mr.	Gary	Brooker		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2450.000	Mrs.	Carlene	Steel		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2451.000	Ms.	Pamela	Unger		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2452.000	Mr.	James	Ranstrom		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2453.000	Dr.	Antonio	Scognamiglio		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2454.000	Ms.	Georgina	Wright		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2455.000	Mr.	Craig Lee	Asbury		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2456.000	Mr.	Sydney	Walter		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2457.000	Ms.	Mary	Williams		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2458.000	Mrs.	L Susan	Griffiths		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2459.000	Ms.	Sheila	Dillon		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2460.000	Miss	Lisa	Mazzola		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2461.000	Ms.	Lauren	Escobales		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2462.000	Ms.	Rose	McKnight		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2463.000	Mrs.	Betty	Kost		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2464.000		Bonnie	Poloner		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2465.000	Dr.	Rebecca	Jacobs-Pollez		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2466.000	Mr.	Gary	Peterson		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2467.000	Miss	Nina	Clausen		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2468.000	Ms.	Norma	Mcculloch		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2469.000	Ms.	Ellen	Sanford		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2470.000	Ms.	Karen	Cappa		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2471.000	Ms.	Amber	Stonik		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2472.000	Dr.	Alessandro	Raganato		6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2473.000	Ms.	Felicia	Ferrington		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2474.000	Ms.	Elaine	Brandt		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2475.000	Miss	Carrie	Thompson		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2476.000	Mr.	Michael	Schulte		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2477.000	Ms.	Arlene	Dreste		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2478.000	Mr.	Jerry	Peavy		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2479.000	Mr.	Philip	Simon		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2480.000	Mrs.	Claudia	Melo		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2481.000	Dr.	Gordon	Schochet		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2482.000	Mrs.	Vinnie	Montez		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2483.000	Mrs.	Dai	Morello		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2484.000	Mr.	Terry	Vollmer		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2485.000	Mrs.	Heike	Brown		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2486.000	Ms.	Mary	Leitch		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2487.000	Ms.	Marsha	Osborn		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2488.000	Mr.	Ryan	Riddle		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2489.000	Mrs.	Liz	Garratt		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2490.000	Mr.	John	Kotarski		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2491.000	Miss	Katja	Sibakov		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2492.000	Ms.	Karen L.	Lew		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2493.000	Mr.	Vern	Southard		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2494.000	Mr.	Adam	D'onofrio		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2495.000	Mr.	Daniel	Konzelman		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2496.000	Mrs.	Peggy	Fugate		6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2497.000	Ms.	Kate	Grotegut		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2498.000	Mr.	Jon	Stewart		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2499.000	Mrs.	Ruth	Bescript		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2500.000	Mrs.	Cindy	Guarnieri		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2501.000	Mrs.	Kim	Westlake		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2502.000	Ms.	Carol	Bostick		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2503.000	Ms.	Julie	Lawell		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2504.000	Mr.	Kenneth	Bird		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2505.000	Mr.	Michael	Johnson		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2506.000	Ms.	Susan	Kiligian		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2507.000	Ms.	Joni	Armstrong		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2508.000	Ms.	M=nica	Salazar		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2509.000	Mrs.	Angela	Leventis		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2510.000	Ms.	Jacqueline	Sgroi		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2511.000	Ms.	Doris	Adebanjo		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2512.000	Ms.	Debra	Rehn		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2513.000	Mrs.	Shirley	Mcnall		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2514.000	Mr.	Jim	Chyle		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2515.000	Mrs.	Liz	Garratt		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2516.000	Mr.	Mark	Johnsen		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2517.000	Mr.	Cave	Man		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2518.000	Ms.	Vanessa	Jamison		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2519.000	Ms.	Karen	Rideout		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2520.000	Mr.	Roland	Goyette		6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2521.000	Mrs.	Lael	Bradshaw		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2522.000	Mr.	Nelson	Baker		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2523.000	Mr.	Scott	Lombardo		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2524.000	Ms.	Marfa	Rodriguez		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2525.000	Ms.	Patricia	Archuleta		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2526.000	Ms.	Lisa	Hey		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2527.000	Ms.	Judy	O'Neill		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2528.000	Mrs.	Dedra	Routh		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2529.000	Ms.	Susan	Gracias		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2530.000	Mrs.	Ann	Breeden		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2531.000	Mr.	Stewart	Rosenkrantz		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2532.000	Miss	Martina	Dinale		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2533.000	Mr.	Al	Kisner		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2534.000	Mrs.	Dai	Morello		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2535.000	Ms.	Sarah	Stewart		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2536.000	Mrs.	Susan	Luckowski		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2537.000	Mr.	Israel	Arroyo		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2538.000	Mr.	Kate	Miller		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2539.000	Ms.	Sarah	Wiebenson		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2540.000	Ms.	Wendy	Mcgowan		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2541.000	Ms.	Margaret	Cramer		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2542.000	Ms.	Portia	Mccracken		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2543.000	Mr.	Dean	Borgeson		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2544.000	Ms.	Maria	Miller		6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2545.000	Mr.	Bruce	White		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2546.000	Mr.	Staya	Vayu		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2547.000	Mr.	Jim	Sickafoose		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2548.000	Mr.	Kenneth	Lapointe		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2549.000	Ms.	Kathleen	Tyson		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2550.000	Ms.	Eileen	MahoodJose		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2551.000	Ms.	Megan	Roemer		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2552.000	Mrs.	Doris	Warnstedt		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2553.000	Mr.	Michael	Ribordy		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2554.000	Mr.	David	Wilson		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2555.000	Ms.	Riva	Sweetrocket		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2556.000	Mr.	Jonathan	Mitchell		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2557.000	Mr.	Sam	Heaton		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2558.000	Mrs.	Susan	Ellis		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2559.000	Ms.	Ann	Kroeber		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2560.000	Mrs.	Carmen Elisa	Bonilla-Jones	WildEarth Guardians	6/23/2014	same form letter	
2561.000	Mrs.	Linda	Peterson		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2562.000	Dr.	Theodora	Manolas		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2563.000	Dr.	Prudence	Brooks		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2564.000	Ms.	Leno	Sislin		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2565.000	Mr.	Thomas	Brenner		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2566.000	Ms.	Alison	Merkel		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2567.000	Mr.	Fred	Grindle		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2568.000	Ms.	Cheryl	Dzubak		6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2569.000	Mr.	Daniel	Daly		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2570.000	Mr.	Fred	Rilling		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2571.000	Ms.	Karen	Cowen		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2572.000	Mr.	Joseph	Breazeale		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2573.000	Miss	Natalie	Van Leekwijck		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2574.000	Ms.	Kristy	Ray		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2575.000	Mr.	John	Frey		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2576.000	Ms.	Edith	Yelland		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2577.000	Ms.	Teresa	Johnson		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2578.000	Ms.	Laura	Wilder		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2579.000	Mrs.	Lisa	Barker		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2580.000	Mr.	Aloysius	Wald		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2581.000	Ms.	Charlot	Morgan Mcneil		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2582.000	Mr.	Joseph	Bieliunas		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2583.000	Ms.	Debbie	Slack		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2584.000	Ms.	Peggy	Dyer		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2585.000	Dr.	Barry	Adelman		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2586.000	Ms.	Corkie	Ramey		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2587.000	Mrs.	Shannon	Shearn		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2588.000	Mrs.	Sherri	Irving		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2589.000	Dr.	Kathleen	Kaiser		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2590.000	Ms.	Donette	Erdmann		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2591.000	Ms.	Carol	Follett		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2592.000	Mrs.	Carol	Jurczewski		6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2593.000	Ms.	Jane	Ahrens		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2594.000	Mrs.	Hilary	Malyon	WildEarth Guardians	6/23/2014	same form letter	
2595.000	Ms.	Janet	Doeden Hansen		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2596.000	Ms.	Jill	Bittner		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2597.000	Ms.	Connie	Kirkham		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2598.000	Ms.	Alexis	Mohr	WildEarth Guardians	6/23/2014	same form letter	
2599.000	Mr.	David	Maceira		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2600.000	Mr.	Samuel	Young		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2601.000	Mr.	Robert	Rutkowski	WildEarth Guardians	6/23/2014	same form letter	
2602.000	Mr.	Pascal	Vercknocke		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2603.000	Mr.	Jason	Bowman		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2604.000	Ms.	Karen	Stickney		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2605.000	Ms.	M. Ruth	Smith		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2606.000	Ms.	Jennifer	Lilienthal		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2607.000	Ms.	Angela	Black		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2608.000	Ms.	Annah	Gardner		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2609.000	Mrs.	Chandra	Hershey-Lear		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2610.000	Mr.	Eric	Schmidt		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2611.000	Mr.	Todd	Gross		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2612.000	Ms.	Gail	Johnston		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2613.000	Mr.	Ernest	Medeiros		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2614.000	Ms.	Sue	Dean		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2615.000	Mr.	Paul	Reed		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2616.000	Mr.	Michael	Kunkel		6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2617.000	Ms.	Patricia	Brooks		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2618.000	Ms.	Genevieve	Esson		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2619.000	Ms.	Marlies	Wierenga		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2620.000	Mrs.	Patty	Felt		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2621.000	Mrs.	Sidney	Robles		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2622.000	Mrs.	Roxanne	Daus		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2623.000	Mrs.	Natalie	Youngberg		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2624.000	Mrs.	Alice	Mulberry		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2625.000	Ms.	Amy	Schumacher		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2626.000	Mr.	Bob	Bousquet	WildEarth Guardians	6/23/2014	same form letter	
2627.000	Ms.	Sandy	Gold		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2628.000	Ms.	Susan	Manning		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2629.000	Mr.	Mark	Gardiner		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2630.000	Mr.	William	Castle		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2631.000	Ms.	Linda	Waine		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2632.000	Mrs.	Jessica	Mitchell		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2633.000	Mr.	Robert	Haslag		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2634.000	Mr.	Chuck	Donegan		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2635.000	Mrs.	Dia	Schumacher		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2636.000	Ms.	Emma	Bradshaw		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2637.000	Mr.	Michael	Helmeste		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2638.000	Mrs.	Deborah	Wilkes		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2639.000	Ms.	Chris	Wolff		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2640.000	Mrs.	Jane	Mcculloch		6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2641.000	Mrs.	Rhonda	Lawford		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2642.000	Mrs.	Karen	Kummer		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2643.000	Mr.	Dave and Rita	Heller		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2644.000	Ms.	Sandy	Zelasko	WildEarth Guardians	6/23/2014	same form letter	
2645.000	Mrs.	Charlene	Henley		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2646.000	Ms.	Monique	Grefe		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2647.000	Ms.	Robin	Dolbear		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2648.000	Ms.	Marijeanne	Sarraille		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2649.000	Ms.	Evelyn	Pietrowski-Ciullo		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2650.000	Mr.	Randall	Foreman		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2651.000	Ms.	Dolores	Guarino		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2652.000	Mrs.	Lisa	McKay		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2653.000	Dr.	Jerry	Rivers		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2654.000	Ms.	Dominique	Mazeaud		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2655.000	Ms.	Tracey	Smallwood		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2656.000	Dr.	Elisabeth	Bechmann		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2657.000	Mr.	Mike	Kaufman		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2658.000	Miss	Hannah	Gardner		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2659.000	Mr.	Franklin	Kapustka		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2660.000	Mr.	Richard	Riger		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2661.000	Mr.	Jim	Snee		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2662.000	Mr.	Norman	Thornton		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2663.000	Ms.	Catherine	Tierney		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2664.000	Mrs.	Stavroula	Voutsiotis		6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2665.000	Mr.	B. Thomas	Diener		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2666.000	Miss	Cathie	Serletic		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2667.000	Ms.	Maureen	Vanderbosch		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2668.000	Ms.	Lanelle	Lovelace		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2669.000	Ms.	Maria Christina	Aragon		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2670.000	Miss	Deirdre	Brownell		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2671.000	Mrs.	Natalie	Alexander		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2672.000	Mr.	Matt	Slade		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2673.000	Ms.	Fay	Forman		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2674.000	Ms.	Peggy	Moody		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2675.000	Ms.	Terri	Sutton		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2676.000	Mr.	John	Viacrucis		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2677.000	Miss	Tonya	Rose		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2678.000	Ms.	Emily	Willoughby		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2679.000	Ms.	Debbie	Brush		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2680.000	Ms.	Beth	Bennion		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2681.000	Ms.	Wendy	Gosker		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2682.000	Ms.	Dolores	Darst		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2683.000	Mrs.	June	Cattell		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2684.000	Miss	Robyn	Reichert		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2685.000	Ms.	Kathy	Hilt		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2686.000	Mr.	Horace	Smith		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2687.000	Ms.	Angie	Unruh		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2688.000	Mrs.	Deborah	Mihalo		6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2689.000	Ms.	Judy	Anastasioi		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2690.000	Mrs.	Julene	Lima		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2691.000	Mrs.	Kaycie	Deem		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2692.000	Ms.	Gail	Yborra		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2693.000	Mrs.	Lori	Esposito		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2694.000	Ms.	Paula	Pruner		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2695.000	Mr.	Shawn	Williamson		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2696.000	Ms.	Carol	Mcgeehan		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2697.000	Mr.	John	Schmittauer		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2698.000	Mrs.	Angie	Hris		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2699.000	Ms.	Jodi	Raven Hawk Silver		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2700.000	Ms.	Saundra	Crowell		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2701.000	Mr.	Bogdan	Bilyk		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2702.000	Mr.	Don	Phillips		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2703.000	Ms.	Mary	Westertlund		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2704.000	Mr.	Rich	Csenge		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2705.000	Ms.	Lauri	Provencher		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2706.000	Mrs.	Christina	Emmerik		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2707.000	Dr.	Cathy	Ream		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2708.000	Mrs.	Krista	Slavin		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2709.000	Ms.	Susan	Stubblefield		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2710.000	Mrs.	Beth	Wegner		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2711.000	Ms.	Marie	Wakefield		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2712.000	Mrs.	Hella	Sturbaut		6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2713.000	Miss	Isabelle	Boisgard		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2714.000	Ms.	Raelyn	Michaelson		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2715.000	Mrs.	Kris	Brinsky		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2716.000	Ms.	Dorieta	Rogers		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2717.000	Ms.	Barbara	Milano		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2718.000	Ms.	Emily	Crasnick		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2719.000	Mr.	Roger	Chemel		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2720.000	Ms.	Cheryl	Ulrich		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2721.000	Mr.	Doug	Landau		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2722.000	Dr.	Glenys	Goetinck		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2723.000	Ms.	Sandy	Toland		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2724.000	Ms.	Cris	Staubach		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2725.000	Mrs.	Lois	Jordan		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2726.000	Ms.	Leslie	Goller		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2727.000	Mrs.	Hilary	Capstick		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2728.000	Ms.	Nicole	Loh		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2729.000	Dr.	Viktoria	Medicine Elk		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2730.000	Mrs.	Dawn	Grib		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2731.000	Mr.	Jim	Pech		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2732.000	Mrs.	Patty	Oberly		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2733.000	Ms.	Karen	Petersen		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2734.000	Mr.	Anthony	Montapert		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2735.000	Ms.	Cc	Carty		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2736.000	Mr.	Richard	Perkowski		6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2737.000	Ms.	Sandra	Materi		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2738.000	Ms.	Terri	Spurr		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2739.000	Ms.	Robin	Bray		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2740.000	Mr.	Terry	Hodgin		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2741.000	Ms.	Joann	Kiva		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2742.000	Ms.	Nancy	Fleming		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2743.000	Ms.	Leslie	van Barselaar		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2744.000	Ms.	Deborah	Voves		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2745.000	Mrs.	Patricia	Berry		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2746.000	Mrs.	Catherine	Warwick		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2747.000	Ms.	Patricia	Gonzalez Lamb		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2748.000	Mrs.	Rebeca	Steinberg		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2749.000	Ms.	Cheri	O'Brien		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2750.000	Ms.	Rebecca	Nafey		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2751.000	Mrs.	Angela	Walter-Schemahorn		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2752.000	Mr.	Ryan	Bradley		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2753.000	Mrs.	Jody	Fritzke		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2754.000	Mrs.	Emanuela	Sala		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2755.000	Mr.	Michael	Snouffer		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2756.000	Mrs.	Diane	Bloom		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2757.000	Ms.	Gwenna	Carlson		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2758.000	Mrs.	Ellen	Kent		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2759.000	Ms.	Mauria	Mcclay		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2760.000	Mrs.	Anne	Lulianelli		6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2761.000	Mr.	Stephen	Eichelberger		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2762.000	Ms.	Jude	Ayer		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2763.000	Ms.	Denise	Vandermeer		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2764.000	Mr.	Austin	Manchester		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2765.000	Ms.	Lea.	Bayliss		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2766.000	Mr.	Robert	Robinson		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2767.000	Dr.	Barbara	Daniels		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2768.000	Ms.	Grace	Feldmann		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2769.000	Ms.	Toni	Caldwell-Clark		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2770.000	Ms.	JoLynn	Jarboe		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2771.000	Mrs.	Charlotte	Flynn		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2772.000	Ms.	Janet	Duran		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2773.000	Ms.	Lasha	Wells	WildEarth Guardians	6/23/2014	same form letter	
2774.000	Ms.	Kathryn	Chouinard		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2775.000	Mr.	David	Murray		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2776.000	Mr.	Jon	Krueger		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2777.000	Mr.	Philip	Johnston		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2778.000	Ms.	Juliann	Rule		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2779.000	Mr.	Jon	Graham		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2780.000	Mr.	William	Crosby		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2781.000	Ms.	Deborah	Zarett		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2782.000	Mr.	E. George	Strasser		6/24/2014	same form letter	
2783.000	Ms.	Janie	Anderson	WildEarth Guardians	6/23/2014	same form letter	
2784.000	Ms.	Lleana	Munoz	WildEarth Guardians	6/23/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2785.000	Mr.	Timmothy	Rinner	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2786.000	Mr.	Cave	Man	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2787.000	Ms.	Caroline	Kipling	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2788.000	Mrs.	Dori	Cole	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2789.000	Mr.	Kevin	Proescholdt	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2790.000	Ms.	Carol	Broll	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2791.000	Ms.	Laura	Napoleon	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2792.000	Ms.	Frances	Archuleta	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2793.000	Mr.	James	Dixon	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2794.000	Ms.	Susan	Torres	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2795.000	Ms.	Aixa	Fielder	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2796.000	Mrs.	Bene	Corti	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2797.000	Mrs.	Isabelle	Roeland	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2798.000	Ms.	Lynn	Reeser	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2799.000	Mr.	Edward	Spevak	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2800.000	Mrs.	Susan	Goldberg	WildEarth Guardians	6/23/2014	same form letter	
2801.000	Mr.	Grant	Wilson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2802.000	Mrs.	Karen	Burroughs	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2803.000	Mr.	Dana	Craig	WildEarth Guardians	6/23/2014	same form letter	
2804.000	Mr.	Daniel	Tham	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2805.000	Mrs.	Nancy	Camacho	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2806.000	Dr.	Dufour	Christine	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2807.000	Mrs.	Ana	Mesner	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2808.000	Ms.	Jennifer	Romans	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2809.000	Mr.	Gustavo	Sandoval	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2810.000	Ms.	Betty	Stewart	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2811.000	Mr.	James	Ripley	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2812.000	Mrs.	Litsa	Katsarou	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2813.000	Ms.	Ana	Chou	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2814.000	Mrs.	Marion	Beens	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2815.000	Mrs.	Margaret	Hashmi	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2816.000	Ms.	Lenore	Greenberg	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2817.000	Mr.	James	Monroe	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2818.000	Ms.	Allie	Tennant	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2819.000	Mr.	L.D. Jr.	Hieber	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2820.000	Mrs.	Patricia	Allaire	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2821.000	Mr.	James	Huffendick	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2822.000	Ms.	Joyce	Frohn	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2823.000	Dr.	Nidia	Rocha	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2824.000	Mr.	Craig	Figtree	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2825.000	Ms.	M Cecilia	Correia	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2826.000	Ms.	Cindy	Curran	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2827.000	Mr.	Chad	Fordham	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2828.000	Ms.	Brenda	Smith	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2829.000	Mrs.	Sarah	Baker	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2830.000	Ms.	Gloria	Picchetti	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2831.000	Ms.	Ellen	Buckley	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2832.000	Ms.	Jenny	Russell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2833.000	Ms.	Susanna	Clason	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2834.000	Mr.	William	Harasym	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2835.000	Ms.	Maki	Murakami	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2836.000	Ms.	Amanda	Scuder	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2837.000	Ms.	MaryAnn	Garcia	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2838.000	Mrs.	Heidi	Bresilge	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2839.000	Ms.	Laura	Manz	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2840.000	Mr.	Albert	Knott	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2841.000	Ms.	Georgia	Brewer	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2842.000	Mr.	Hap	Hagood	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2843.000	Dr.	Susan	Shaw	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2844.000	Ms.	Connie	Chambers	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2845.000	Mr.	Sanford	Brown	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2846.000	Mrs.	Deborah	Stowe	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2847.000	Ms.	Anita	Garrison	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2848.000	Mr.	Suneet	Srivastava	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2849.000	Mr.	David	Mason	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2850.000	Ms.	Myma	Foust	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2851.000	Ms.	Kathy	Jacobs	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2852.000	Ms.	Darlene	Niman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2853.000	Mrs.	Angela	Barton	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2854.000	Ms.	Sally	Higgs	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2855.000	Mr.	Bene	Arnold	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2856.000	Mrs.	Claudia	Garoutte	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2857.000	Mrs.	Patricia	Raven	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2858.000	Mr.	Thomas	Bragg	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2859.000	Ms.	Barbara	Ginsberg	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2860.000	Mr.	Frank	Cullen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2861.000	Mrs.	Jeanne	Thomas	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2862.000	Ms.	Kay	Wilson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2863.000	Ms.	Christina	Metcalf	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2864.000	Ms.	Marilynn	Mitchell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2865.000	Ms.	Phyllis	Cafagna	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2866.000	Ms.	Elaine	Becker	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2867.000	Mr.	Bob	Wallhagen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2868.000	Ms.	Melinda	Shaw	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2869.000	Ms.	Jean	Cameron	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2870.000	Mr.	Barry	Hatfield	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2871.000	Ms.	Manuela	Arioloi	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2872.000	Mr.	John	Deddy	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2873.000	Ms.	Meryle A.	Korn	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2874.000	Ms.	Iris	Chynoweth	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2875.000	Miss	Eliette	Bozzola	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2876.000	Ms.	Laurette	Culbert	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2877.000	Mrs.	Sharon	Bender	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2878.000	Ms.	Suzanne	Wheeler	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2879.000	Ms.	Jessica	Donadelli	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2880.000	Ms.	Diane	McLaughlin	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2881.000	Ms.	Hunter	Lovins	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2882.000	Mr.	Daniel	Meier	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2883.000	Mrs.	Marie	Danna	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2884.000	Ms.	Cheryl	Zellmer	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2885.000	Dr.	Joseph	Andrade	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2886.000	Ms.	Ginger	Hill	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2887.000	Ms.	Marianne	Gurley	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2888.000	Mr.	Brett	Dennison	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2889.000	Mr.	Joe	Volpe	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2890.000	Ms.	Esther	Garvett	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2891.000	Mr.	James	Mulcare	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2892.000	Dr.	Tracy	Kalkwarf	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2893.000	Mr.	Kenneth	Helleberg	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2894.000	Mr.	Stuart	Weiss	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2895.000	Mrs.	Fran	Good Medicine Wolf Klabunde	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2896.000	Ms.	Lynn	Wilbur	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2897.000	Mr.	Alan	Serlin	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2898.000	Mr.	David	Knight	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2899.000	Mrs.	Chantal	Buslot	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2900.000	Mr.	Hal	Trufan	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2901.000	Mr.	Ed	McDowell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2902.000	Mr.	Raymond	Kalendek	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2903.000	Mr.	Marco	Pardi	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2904.000	Ms.	Anne	Becker	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2905.000	Mrs.	Dawn	Picard	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2906.000	Mr.	Domenico	Mastrototaro	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2907.000	Ms.	Florina	Antonia	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2908.000	Dr.	Josh	Pelleg	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2909.000	Ms.	Cari	Brookbanks	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2910.000	Ms.	Michele	Cornelius	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2911.000	Mrs.	Susan	Brown	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2912.000	Mr.	David	Osterhoudt	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2913.000	Ms.	Martha	Izzo	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2914.000	Mr.	Leland	Brun	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2915.000	Mrs.	Antonia	Salaz	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2916.000	Ms.	Maureen	Burke	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2917.000	Ms.	Irena	Franchi	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2918.000	Mr.	Richard	Laubhan	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2919.000	Mr.	Don	Wood	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2920.000	Ms.	June	Kirk	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2921.000	Mr.	Theodore	Mertig	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2922.000	Ms.	Heather	Rider	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2923.000	Mr.	Ben	Dugger	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2924.000	Ms.	Kye	Lesmond	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2925.000	Ms.	Paula	Hansen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2926.000	Dr.	Richard	Rothstein	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2927.000	Dr.	Sharon	Lacy	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2928.000	Dr.	Steven G.	Kellman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2929.000	Mrs.	Florence	Wagner	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2930.000	Mrs.	Sarah	Desousa	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2931.000	Ms.	Anne	Trinz	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2932.000	Mr.	Robert	Khunert	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2933.000	Mrs.	Patricia	Mackinnon	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2934.000	Mrs.	Karina	Black	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2935.000	Ms.	Barbara	Delgiudice	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2936.000	Miss	Alicia	Paravola	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2937.000	Ms.	Flora	Wang	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2938.000	Mrs.	Dorothy	Nylen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2939.000	Ms.	Leslie	Hickcox	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2940.000	Mrs.	Andrea	Zinn	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2941.000	Miss	Emmy	Koponen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2942.000	Mrs.	Mary	Lewis	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2943.000	Mr.	James	Anthony	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2944.000	Mr.	Joseph	Roberts	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2945.000	Ms.	Monica	Germano	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2946.000	Ms.	Kathi	Ridgway	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2947.000	Mr.	Gw	Cheney	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2948.000	Mrs.	Christine	Gillen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2949.000	Mr.	Leo	Tobin	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2950.000	Ms.	Cynthia	Bobrek	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2951.000	Ms.	Sally	Purbrick-Illek	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2952.000	Mrs.	Joann	Miller	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2953.000	Mr.	Marco	Santora	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2954.000	Mrs.	Margarita	Rosberg	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2955.000	Ms.	Barbara	Arlen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2956.000	Ms.	Christine	Schaffer	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2957.000	Mr.	Stephen	Johnson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2958.000	Mr.	Allan	Yorkowitz	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2959.000	Ms.	Jane	Chischilly	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2960.000	Miss	Monica	Quinones	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2961.000	Miss	Melanie	Craig	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2962.000	Mr.	Michael	Martin	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2963.000	Ms.	Hannelore	Kennedy	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2964.000	Mr.	John	Contos	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2965.000	Ms.	Bethany	Bradshaw	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2966.000	Ms.	Marianne	Stoll	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2967.000	Mrs.	Stacy	Lupori	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2968.000	Miss	Line	Ringgard	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2969.000	Mrs.	Deborah	Lipman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2970.000	Dr.	Alice	Petersen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2971.000	Mrs.	Nancy	Matthews	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2972.000	Mr.	Tony	Sgroi	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2973.000	Ms.	Lauren	Swaim	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2974.000	Mr.	Steven	Carpenter	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2975.000	Mr.	Nicholas	Prychodko	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2976.000	Miss	Amanda	Allen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
2977.000	Mr.	Arthur	Meincke	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2978.000	Ms.	Shirley	Johannsen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2979.000	Mr.	Robert	Tafanelli	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2980.000	Mr.	Richard E	Cooley	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2981.000	Mrs.	Darlene	Wolf	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2982.000	Mrs.	Joyce	Grajczyk	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2983.000	Mr.	Frank	Florio	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2984.000	Mr.	Michael	Weaver	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2985.000	Ms.	Pamela	Sleeper	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2986.000	Mr.	Paul	Sinacore	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2987.000	Mr.	John	Todd	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2988.000	Ms.	Esther	Garvett	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2989.000	Mr.	Tom	Hurt	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2990.000	Miss	Laura	Mutoz	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2991.000	Miss	Bobbi-Lee	Smart	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2992.000	Ms.	Cynthia	Brooks-Fetty	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2993.000	Mrs.	Morgan	Macconaugha-Snyder	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2994.000	Ms.	Barbara	Delmestri	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2995.000	Mr.	Noah and Natasha	Brenner	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2996.000	Mr.	Cameron	Coffman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2997.000	Ms.	Michelle	Stern	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2998.000	Mr.	Federico	Bortoletto	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
2999.000	Ms.	Sarah	Keesling	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3000.000	Mr.	Edward	Carey	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3001.000	Mrs.	Josephine	Harrison	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3002.000	Mr.	Jon	Spitz	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3003.000	Mr.	Dennis	Hartenstine	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3004.000	Mrs.	Barbara	Warner	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3005.000	Mrs.	Jutta	Seidl	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3006.000	Mrs.	Mary	Martinez	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3007.000	Mr.	Dave	Rich	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3008.000	Mr.	Andrea	Yokers	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3009.000	Miss	Gudrun	Dennis	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3010.000	Mr.	Lynn	Morrow	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3011.000	Ms.	Morrigan	Black	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3012.000	Ms.	Cathy	Seay	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3013.000	Miss	Samantha	Siler	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3014.000	Ms.	Sandy	Sobanski	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3015.000	Ms.	Judi	Weiner	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3016.000	Ms.	Lynn	Rogers	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3017.000	Ms.	Barbara	Juskiewicz	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3018.000	Mr.	Ed	Laurson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3019.000	Mr.	Danny	Castroi	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3020.000	Miss	Aubrey	Guilbault	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3021.000	Mr.	Jeffrey	Shuben	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3022.000	Mr.	Brad	Higgs	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3023.000	Mr.	Harvey	Hyman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3024.000	Ms.	Nancy	Gathing	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3025.000	Ms.	Sarah	Townsend	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3026.000	Ms.	Kellie	Smith	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3027.000	Mr.	Wayne	Labeaud	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3028.000	Dr.	Gene	Trapp	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3029.000	Mrs.	Melissa	Polick	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3030.000	Ms.	Diane	Jalbert	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3031.000	Ms.	Barbara	Gage	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3032.000	Ms.	Nicole	Rosa	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3033.000	Dr.	Steven J.	Prince	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3034.000	Ms.	Rebecca	Lyon	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3035.000	Mr.	Robert	Anderson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3036.000	Ms.	Kaye	Gucciardo	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3037.000	Ms.	Karen	Hedwig Backman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3038.000	Mrs.	Jennifer	Edwards	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3039.000	Mr.	Steven	Levine	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3040.000	Mr.	David	Zielke	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3041.000	Miss	Ashley	Heffner	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3042.000	Dr.	Conrad	Sheff	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3043.000	Ms.	Mary	Riblett	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3044.000	Dr. Rev.	Gordon	Hills	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3045.000	Mr.	Michael	Moore	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3046.000	Mr.	Patrick	Knif	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3047.000	Dr.	Douglas	Yearout	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3048.000	Ms.	Deborah	Fitzgerald	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3049.000	Mr.	Donald	Dimock	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3050.000	Mrs.	June	Macarthur	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3051.000	Mrs.	Cynthia	Anderson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3052.000	Ms.	Karen	Connell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3053.000	Ms.	Deborah	Schechter	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3054.000	Dr.	Thomas	Bennett	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3055.000	Mrs.	Karen	Ziomek Vayda	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3056.000	Mr.	Adam	Heckle	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3057.000	Mrs.	Renee	Tierney	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3058.000	Mr.	Joseph	Buhowsky	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3059.000	Ms.	Sue	Davies	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3060.000	Ms.	Gina	Santonas	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3061.000	Mr.	John	Champine	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3062.000	Mr.	William	Luzzi	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3063.000	Mrs.	Bonna	Mettie	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3064.000	Mrs.	Honey	Chambers	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3065.000	Mr.	Randy	Harrison	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3066.000	Ms.	Kelly	Brannigan	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3067.000	Ms.	Lisha	Doucet	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3068.000	Mr.	Trenton	Mabey	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3069.000	Mr.	Russ	Cross	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3070.000	Mr.	Ted	Fishman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3071.000	Dr.	Todd	Monson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3072.000	Mrs.	Marnie	Gaede	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3073.000	Ms.	Mary	O'byrne	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3074.000	Mrs.	Mary	Housel	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3075.000	Ms.	Jennifer	Planeta	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3076.000	Mr.	Alec	Hendrickson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3077.000	Mrs.	Mary	Thoma	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3078.000	Ms.	Joann	Ramos	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3079.000	Mr.	Ronald	Johnson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3080.000	Ms.	Evette	Pike	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3081.000	Mrs.	Marianne	Frusteri	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3082.000	Ms.	Jennifer	Rials	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3083.000	Mrs.	Jill	Hunt	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3084.000	Mr.	Michael	Darling	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3085.000	Mrs.	Frederique	Joy	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3086.000	Ms.	Alejandra	Vega	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3087.000	Ms.	Lindy	Friedman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3088.000	Ms.	Lois	Sparkman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3089.000	Mr.	Tim	Price	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3090.000	Ms.	Joanne	Groshardt	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3091.000	Mr.	Earl	Frounfeiter	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	I am disappointed "but not surprised"	
3092.000	Mrs.	Michele	Smith	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3093.000	Mr.	John	Thompson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3094.000	Ms.	Ginny	Jackson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3095.000	Ms.	Elanne	Palcich	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	The people are speaking	
3096.000	Ms.	Nancy	Rieser	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3097.000	Mr.	Alessandro	Verzola	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3098.000	Mr.	Terry	King	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3099.000	Mr.	David	Hollier	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3100.000	Ms.	Susan	Church	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3101.000	Ms.	Nancy	Anderson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3102.000	Mr.	Michael	Bruck	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3103.000	Mr.	Robert	Orndorff	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3104.000	Mr.	Martin and Sharon	McGladdery	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3105.000	Ms.	Ann	Wright	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3106.000	Ms.	Buffy	Hake	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3107.000	Mr.	Allen	Swift	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3108.000	Mrs.	Laurie	Conroy	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3109.000	Dr.	Doyle	McClure	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3110.000	Miss	Carol	Johnson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3111.000	Ms.	Shelley	Hartz	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3112.000	Mr.	Russell	Green	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3113.000	Ms.	Sara	Paoluzzi	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3114.000	Mr.	David	Hand	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3115.000	Ms.	Ellie	Price	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3116.000	Mr.	John	Seeburger	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3117.000	Mrs.	Sigrid	Moranz	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3118.000	Ms.	Laura	Krause	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3119.000	Ms.	Margery	Race	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3120.000	Ms.	Nancy	Omara	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3121.000	Mr.	Barry	Knudsen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3122.000	Ms.	Lilit	Margaryan	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3123.000	Mr.	Ronald	Brown	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3124.000	Mrs.	Robin	Peterson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3125.000	Mr.	Malcolm	Seaholm	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3126.000	Ms.	Holly	McDuffie	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3127.000	Mr.	Harold	Watson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3128.000	Miss	Jennifer	Sumiyoshi	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3129.000	Ms.	Jane	Noble	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3130.000	Mrs.	Deanna	Pucci	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3131.000	Mr.	David	Robinson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3132.000	Mr.	Erik	Fredrickson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3133.000	Mrs.	Nancy	Sanderson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3134.000	Mr.	Bruce	Ross	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3135.000	Ms.	Sheryl	Lee	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3136.000	Ms.	Catherine	Anders	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3137.000	Mr.	Thomas	Welton	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3138.000	Ms.	Michele	Page	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3139.000	Mrs.	Betty	Chan	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3140.000	Ms.	Melissa	Cathcart	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3141.000	Ms.	Barbara	Scott	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3142.000	Ms.	Debra	Fox	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3143.000	Ms.	Patricia	Van Cour	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3144.000	Miss	Camila	Cossio	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3145.000	Dr.	Conrad	Sheff	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3146.000	Mr.	Matthew	Franck	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3147.000	Ms.	Lori	Alaniva	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3148.000	Mr.	Jeff	Potter	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3149.000	Miss	Silvana	Zelmanovich	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3150.000	Mr.	William	Stewart	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3151.000	Mr.	Geoffrey	Lawrence	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3152.000	Ms.	Erma	Lowe	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3153.000	Ms.	Cathy	Ruperti	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3154.000	Ms.	Nicole	Strathmann	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3155.000	Mr.	Christopher	Marrero	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3156.000	Mr.	Nicholas	Mantas	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3157.000	Ms.	Sandra	Speicher	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3158.000	Mr.	Kenneth	Davies	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3159.000	Ms.	Pari	Morse	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3160.000	Mr.	Lloyd	Hedger	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3161.000	Dr.	John	Brinkley	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3162.000	Mr.	Michael	Maggied	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3163.000	Ms.	Deborah	Lone Wolf-Kitzul	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3164.000	Mrs.	Cey	Forschner-Hell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3165.000	Ms.	Madonna	Depalo	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3166.000	Mr.	Steven	Keul	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3167.000	Mrs.	Cathy	Nieman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3168.000	Mr.	J. David	Scott	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3169.000	Mr.	Kenneth	Robertson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3170.000	Ms.	Susan	Rubin	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3171.000	Mrs.	Angie	Mason	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3172.000	Mr.	Leif	Bjornson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3173.000	Ms.	Sasha	Shapior	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3174.000	Mrs.	Linda	Allen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3175.000	Ms.	Carol	Lipper	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3176.000	Dr.	Catherine	Barrows	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3177.000	Mr.	Robert	Wolf	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3178.000	Ms.	Karen	Keating-Secular	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3179.000	Ms.	Mariu	Suarez	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3180.000	Mrs.	Jane	Lynch	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3181.000	Mr.	Daniel	Piser	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3182.000	Ms.	Michelle	Kaufman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3183.000	Mrs.	Patricia	Berna	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3184.000	Ms.	Julie	Martin	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3185.000	Ms.	Debbie	Williamson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3186.000	Mrs.	Beth	Niederman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3187.000	Mrs.	Susan	Vogt	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3188.000	Mrs.	Barbara	Greenwood	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3189.000	Mr.	David	Ziegler	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3190.000	Mr.	Jim	Corriere	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3191.000	Mrs.	Gynette	Cathey	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3192.000	Mrs.	Maria	Arefieva	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3193.000	Mr.	Charles	Jos Biviano	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3194.000	Dr.	Margaret	Latourrette	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3195.000	Mr.	Leland	Long	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3196.000	Ms.	Joanne	Wagner	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3197.000	Ms.	Barbara	Deur	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3198.000	Ms.	Deborah	Bradford	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3199.000	Dr.	Laurie	Cassidy	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3200.000	Mrs.	Nicole	Weber	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3201.000	Dr.	Derrell	Chambers	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3202.000	Ms.	Frances	Kelly	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3203.000	Ms.	Ljiljana	Millic	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3204.000	Mr.	Robert	Giguere	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3205.000	Ms.	Michele	Boderck	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3206.000	Mr.	Christopher	Dawson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3207.000	Ms.	Carol	Collins	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3208.000	Mrs.	Marnee	Reilly	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3209.000	Ms.	Barbara	Deur	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3210.000	Mrs.	Jill	Turco	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3211.000	Mr.	Lawrence	Cromwell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3212.000	Mr.	Darvin	Schild	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3213.000	Ms.	Kirsten	Kuhre-Holmquist	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3214.000	Mr.	Kenneth	Stack	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3215.000	Mr.	Dustin	Brunson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3216.000	Ms.	Diana	Goslin	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3217.000	Mr.	Noel	Blythe	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3218.000	Mrs.	Phyllis	Van Leuven	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3219.000	Ms.	L E	Slattery	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3220.000	Mrs.	Nancy	Bain	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3221.000	Miss	Laura	Zimmerman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3222.000	Mr.	Max	Salt	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3223.000	Ms.	Irene	Stowe	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3224.000	Ms.	Alyce	Caulder	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3225.000	Miss	Encama	Ortiz	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3226.000	Ms.	Karen	Spradlin	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3227.000	Ms.	Christina	Viljoen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3228.000	Mrs.	Joyce	Janicki	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3229.000	Ms.	Georgia	Shankel	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3230.000	Ms.	Judy	Fairless	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3231.000	Mrs.	Susan	Thurairatnam	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3232.000	Mr.	Justin	Healey	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3233.000	Ms.	Cynthia	Murphy	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3234.000	Mrs.	Chris	Wordlaw	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3235.000	Mrs.	Chris	Bogdan	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3236.000	Mrs.	Helene	Morissette	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3237.000		Robert	Wing	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3238.000	Ms.	Jane	Hope	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3239.000	Dr.	Jeffrey	Surovell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3240.000	Ms.	Eileen	Welch	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3241.000	Mrs.	Allison	Castle	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3242.000	Ms.	Gina	Bilwin	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3243.000	Mr.	Paul	Henry	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3244.000	Ms.	Te-Fen	Chen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3245.000	Ms.	Elaine	Taylor	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3246.000	Ms.	Bianca	Molgora	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3247.000	Mr.	Chris	Hunter	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3248.000	Mr.	David	Doty	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3249.000	Mrs.	Jean	Lewandowski	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3250.000	Ms.	Char	Laughon	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3251.000	Dr.	Lonnie	Somer	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3252.000	Ms.	Linda	Bescript	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3253.000	Ms.	Judy	Schoemaker	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3254.000	Ms.	Stanley	Becker	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3255.000	Ms.	Rachelle	Parks	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3256.000	Mr.	JC	Corcoran	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3257.000	Ms.	Aubury	Smith	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3258.000	Mrs.	Mary	Beattie	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3259.000	Mr.	Robert	Rosas	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3260.000	Ms.	Simone	Vargas	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3261.000	Ms.	Eleanor	Navarro	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3262.000	Ms.	Debbie	Thomas	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3263.000	Ms.	Susan	Bucklin	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3264.000	Ms.	Karin	Peck	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3265.000	Mr.	Robert	Weber	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3266.000	Mr.	Fabiano	Gerard	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3267.000	Mrs.	Janice	Phillips	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3268.000	Ms.	Catherine	Johnston	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3269.000	Mr.	Richard	Khanlian	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3270.000	Ms.	Tina	Brown	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3271.000	Ms.	j	angell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3272.000	Mr.	Peter	Faure	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3273.000	Ms.	C.	Kershner	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3274.000	Ms.	Maureen	Primerano	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3275.000	Mr.	Robin	Smith	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3276.000	Ms.	Tamara	Abashian	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3277.000	Mrs.	Monika	Huber	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3278.000	Dr.	Kevin	Moore	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3279.000	Mr.	Thomas	Simon	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3280.000	Mr.	Martin	Margolis	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3281.000	Mr.	Eric	Edwards	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3282.000	Mrs.	Eva	Thiemann	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3283.000	Mrs.	Lisa	Neste	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3284.000	Ms.	Harriet	Cohen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3285.000	Ms.	Judith	Hazelton	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3286.000	Ms.	Denise	Bligh	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3287.000	Mr.	John R	Poole	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3288.000	Ms.	Susan	Gordon	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3289.000	Mr.	Barry	Kelman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3290.000	Mrs.	Jean	Mixon	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3291.000	Ms.	Annmarie	Murphy	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3292.000	Mr.	Lisa	Neste	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3293.000	Mr.	Frederik	De Benoist	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3294.000	Ms.	Leone	Batte	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3295.000	Mrs.	Takako	Ishii-Kiefer	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3296.000	Ms.	Toni	Russell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3297.000	Mrs.	Annie	Mccuen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3298.000	Mr.	Thomas	Windberg	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3299.000	Miss	Gwenn	Meltzer	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3300.000	Mr.	Henry	Gaudsmith	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3301.000	Ms.	Midori	Furutate	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3302.000	Mrs.	Laraine	Bowen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3303.000	Mr.	Tim	Hogan	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3304.000	Ms.	Roberta	Desalle	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3305.000	Ms.	Charlotte	Egger	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3306.000	Ms.	Paula	Shafransky	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3307.000	Mr.	Dale	Patterson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3308.000	Mr.	Harry	Mauney	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3309.000	Ms.	Robin	Craft	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3310.000	Mrs.	Julie	Lumby	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3311.000	Ms.	Alice	Artzt	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3312.000	Mr.	Peter	Rubin	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3313.000	Mrs.	Judy	Mckinney	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3314.000	Mrs.	Susan	Vanderzee	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3315.000	Mr.	Vincent	Patti	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3316.000	Miss	Elizabeth	Abrantes	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3317.000	Ms.	Carol	Valint	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3318.000	Mr.	Stephen	Filler	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3319.000	Mr.	Robert	Husbands	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3320.000	Mr.	Frank	Smucker	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3321.000	Ms.	Catherine	Lanzi	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3322.000	Ms.	Veda	Stram	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3323.000	Ms.	Betty	Vignes	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3324.000	Ms.	Noenoe	Barney-Campbell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3325.000	Ms.	Judy	Moran	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3326.000	Ms.	Mary	True	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3327.000	Mr.	John	Kubisiak	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3328.000	Mr.	Ken	Mundy	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3329.000	Mrs.	Susan	Allen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3330.000	Mr.	Alan	Haggard	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3331.000	Mr.	Karl	Koessel	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3332.000	Mr.	Nick	Grantz	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3333.000	Ms.	K	G	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3334.000	Ms.	Kym	Waugh	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3335.000	Ms.	Larissa	Matthews	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3336.000	Ms.	Aditi	Sundarajan	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3337.000	Miss	Bronzesean	Knight	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3338.000	Ms.	Barbara	Kantola	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3339.000	Ms.	Connie	Colvin	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3340.000	Miss	Sara	Avery	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3341.000	Mrs.	Hiroe	Watanabe	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3342.000	Mrs.	Lauretta	Roche	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3343.000	Mr.	Gerry	Wolfe	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3344.000	Mr.	Derek	Meyer	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3345.000	Mrs.	Carol	Dibbens	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3346.000	Mr.	Brian	Christian	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3347.000	Mrs.	Antonella	Nielsen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3348.000	Ms.	Shawneen	Finnegan	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3349.000	Mr.	Gary	Carpenter	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3350.000	Ms.	Brenda	Haig	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3351.000	Mr.	Eric	Janty	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3352.000	Ms.	Judy	Genandt	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3353.000	Mrs.	Judith	Greil	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3354.000	Mr.	Spencer	Stall	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3355.000	Mr.	Dewitt	Henderson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3356.000	Miss	Pippa	Moye	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3357.000	Mr.	Steve	Overton	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3358.000	Ms.	Julie	Schampel	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3359.000	Mrs.	Sylviane	Mahaux	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3360.000	Mrs.	Caroline	Stvilla	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3361.000	Ms.	Roseanne	Yerges	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3362.000	Ms.	Virginia	Mees	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3363.000	Ms.	Ann Marie	Hoff	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3364.000	Ms.	Joan	Cole	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3365.000	Ms.	Nancy	Martin	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3366.000	Miss	Beatrice	Silvestre	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3367.000	Ms.	Janice	Gloe	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3368.000	Mr.	Bruno	Ribeiro	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3369.000	Mr.	Ian	Peisner	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3370.000	Mr.	Chris	Davis	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3371.000	Mrs.	Carola	Tschiemer	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3372.000	Mrs.	Bridget	Palecek	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3373.000	Dr.	William	Leeson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3374.000	Ms.	Kerry	Macinnes	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3375.000	Dr.	Jason A. and Mrs. Linda E.	Lillegraven	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3376.000	Ms.	J.B.	Johnson-Allen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3377.000	Mr.	Richard	Waldo	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3378.000	Ms.	Meryl	Pinque	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3379.000	Mr.	Gary	Christensen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3380.000	Dr.	Daniel	Faisal	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3381.000	Miss	Jennifer	Scott	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3382.000	Miss	Angela	Van Cranenbroek	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3383.000	Ms.	Ruth	Johnston	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3384.000	Ms.	Christina	Mcvie	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3385.000	Mr.	Chester	Lusk	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3386.000	Ms.	Valarie	Snell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3387.000	Ms.	Laurie	Maitre	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3388.000	Mr.	Eric	Pincepoche	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3389.000	Mr.	Clay	Baumung	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3390.000	Mr.	Noel	Park	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3391.000	Mr.	Thomas	Lewis	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3392.000	Ms.	Pamela	Jarvie	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3393.000	Mrs.	Mona	Gr°nbuk	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3394.000	Dr.	Helmut	Mueller	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3395.000	Ms.	Benita	Musleve	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3396.000	Mrs.	Barbara	Orr	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3397.000	Mrs.	Valerie	Hildebrand	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3398.000	Mrs.	Traci	Phillips	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3399.000	Mrs.	Candy	Rocha	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3400.000	Ms.	Chris	Montalbano	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3401.000	Mr.	Dennis	Kelly	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3402.000	Ms.	Anne	Curran	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3403.000	Ms.	Sandra	Giardini	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3404.000	Mr.	Michael	Panasci	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3405.000	Mrs.	Margaret	Lohr	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3406.000	Mr.	G	Beam	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3407.000	Miss	Mindy	Maxwell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3408.000	Ms.	Sandra	Schomberg	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3409.000	Mr.	Robert	Leggett	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3410.000	Ms.	Bernadette	Barberini	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3411.000	Ms.	Yvonne	Christison	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3412.000	Mrs.	Sharon	Chang	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3413.000	Ms.	Mary	Neumann	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3414.000	Mr.	Malcolm	Wellington	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3415.000	Ms.	Suzy	Berkowitz	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3416.000	Mr.	Thom	MacDonald	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3417.000	Mr.	Cato	Dubo	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3418.000	Mr.	Richard	Dimatteo	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3419.000	Mrs.	Elaine	Berg	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3420.000	Ms.	Annette	Cleary	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3421.000	Mr.	Rob	Rondanini	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3422.000	Mr.	John	Peeters	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3423.000	Mrs.	L Eleanor	Finney	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3424.000	Mr.	Ronn	Koester	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3425.000	Miss	Melissa	Cover	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3426.000	Ms.	Denise	Kobylarz	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3427.000	Mr.	Steve	Slater	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3428.000	Mr.	John	Doerich	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3429.000	Mrs.	Barbara	Branham	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3430.000	Dr.	Dorothy	Kethler	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3431.000	Mrs.	M.	Dnrrenberg	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3432.000	Mr.	Dave	Plaehn	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3433.000	Mr.	Kent	Garrett	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3434.000	Miss	Shannon	Horn	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3435.000	Mrs.	Ginny	Siferd	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3436.000	Ms.	Rebecca	Gelletoo	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3437.000	Ms.	Jean	Cheesman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3438.000	Mrs.	Waltraud	Usahanun	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3439.000	Mrs.	Trina	Hawkins	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3440.000	Mrs.	Debbie	Miller	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3441.000	Mrs.	Jeanette	Capotorto	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3442.000	Dr.	Theresa	Incagnoli	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3443.000	Ms.	Beth	Tatum	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3444.000	Ms.	Ellen	Segal	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3445.000	Ms.	Roxanne	Doremus	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3446.000	Ms.	Carol	Freese	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3447.000	Ms.	Floss	Shahbegian	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3448.000	Mr.	Douglas	Lawrence	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3449.000	Ms.	Cheryl	Jennings	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3450.000	Miss	Rose	Puntillo	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3451.000	Mr.	Kent	Swenson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3452.000	Ms.	Dana	Whitney	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3453.000	Mrs.	Ricki	Newman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3454.000	Ms.	Margaret	Beck	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3455.000	Ms.	Susan	Pelakh	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3456.000	Mr.	Colonel	Meyer	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3457.000	Mr.	Tim	Barrington	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3458.000	Ms.	Karen	Wible	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3459.000	Ms.	Lauren	Kozen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3460.000	Mrs.	Linda	Segal	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3461.000	Mr.	Gary	Coles	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3462.000	Mr.	John	Johnson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3463.000	Ms.	Juliann	Pinto	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3464.000	Mrs.	Sandra	Barnhart	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3465.000	Ms.	V	Brandt	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3466.000	Mr.	Joel	Piecuch	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3467.000	Ms.	Catherine	Phipps	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3468.000	Ms.	Jean	Gallick	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3469.000	Ms.	Gail	Bell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3470.000	Ms.	Mary	Davis	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3471.000	Mr.	Michael	McQuown	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3472.000	Ms.	Cynthia	Stave	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3473.000	Mrs.	Michelle	Graves	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3474.000	Miss	Cinzia	Caporali	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3475.000	Miss	Marly	Wexler	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3476.000	Ms.	Terry	Tedesco-Kerrick	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3477.000	Mrs.	Anneke	Andries	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3478.000	Miss	Rucha	Harde	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3479.000	Mr.	Mark	Kubiak	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3480.000	Mr.	Steve	Schueth	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3481.000	Ms.	Joycelyn	Patterson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3482.000	Ms.	Lynette	Dumont	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3483.000	Mrs.	Donna	Bonetti	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3484.000	Miss	Andrea	Kendall	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3485.000	Mr.	Frank	Hill	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3486.000	Dr.	J.	Edwards	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3487.000	Mrs.	Ginette	Chapet	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3488.000	Ms.	Wrenn	Reed	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3489.000	Ms.	Carol	Johnson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3490.000	Mrs.	Shelly	Jones	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3491.000	Ms.	Debra	Hitchcock	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3492.000	Ms.	Marilynn	Szydlowski	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3493.000	Mr.	Frank	Hill	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3494.000	Ms.	Sherry	Geddes	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3495.000	Mrs.	Dorene	Randall	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3496.000	Ms.	Monica	Jelonnek	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3497.000	Ms.	Pewter	Katts	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3498.000	Dr.	Bruce	Switzer	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3499.000	Ms.	Laura	Ackerman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3500.000	Ms.	J	Wiehl	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3501.000	Mrs.	Amy	Park	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3502.000	Ms.	Ursela	Rabe	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3503.000	Ms.	Noris	Nunez	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3504.000	Mr.	Grant	Low	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3505.000	Mr.	David	Ward	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3506.000	Mrs.	Theresa	Campbell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3507.000	Mrs.	Sylvie	Julien	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3508.000	Ms.	Alita	DeMarco	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3509.000	Dr.	Justin	Schmidt	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3510.000	Ms.	Terri	Winter	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3511.000	Ms.	Susan	Goldstein	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3512.000	Mr.	William	Peterson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3513.000	Ms.	Judith	Dove	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3514.000	Dr.	Allison	Alberts	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3515.000	Ms.	Barbara	Hillmer	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3516.000	Ms.	Dian	Berger	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3517.000	Miss	Melania	Padilla	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3518.000	Ms.	Karen	Deckel	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3519.000	Mr.	Jack Preston	Marshall	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3520.000	Mrs.	Beverly	Bradshaw	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3521.000	Mrs.	Ella	Reeves	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3522.000	Mr.	Walter	Ramsey	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3523.000	Mr.	Gus	Gomez	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3524.000	Mrs.	Giovanna	Tarquinio	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3525.000	Ms.	Janet	Yacht	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3526.000	Mr.	Rob	Jursa	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3527.000	Ms.	Kellee	Herington	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3528.000	Ms.	Marguerite	Smukler	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3529.000	Dr.	Sheila	Dempsey	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3530.000	Ms.	Christine	Porter	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3531.000	Dr.	Phil	Berry	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3532.000	Mr.	Lowell	Palm	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3533.000	Mrs.	Carol	Gilster	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3534.000	Ms.	Emily	Boliver	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3535.000	Mr.	Michael	Ahern	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3536.000	Mrs.	Tracy	Robles	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3537.000	Ms.	Nola Jean	Myers	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3538.000	Ms.	Laura	Nevins	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3539.000	Ms.	Lisa	D'ambrosio	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3540.000	Ms.	Andrea	Rose	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3541.000	Mr.	Tim	Zemba	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3542.000	Ms.	Marj	Waite	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3543.000	Mr.	Richard	McKee	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3544.000	Dr.	K.e.	Von Wittelsbach	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3545.000	Ms.	Jill	Simon	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3546.000	Mr.	Phillip	Shook	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3547.000	Miss	Alex	Knapton	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3548.000	Mr.	Robert	Zill	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3549.000	Miss	Cristina	Novelo	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3550.000	Ms.	Barbara	Booher	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3551.000	Ms.	Carol	Cavanaugh	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3552.000	Mrs.	Kaye	Porter	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3553.000	Mrs.	Elsy	Shallman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3554.000	Ms.	Gena	Burrows	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3555.000	Mr.	Dave	Linnane	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3556.000	Miss	Michelle	Hayward	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3557.000	Mrs.	Patti	Gallo	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3558.000	Mr.	Brad	Lagorio	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3559.000	Mrs.	Marge	Gianelli	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3560.000	Ms.	Katharine	Clark	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3561.000	Mr.	Phillip	Crabill	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3562.000	Ms.	Mary	Furlong	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3563.000	Mr.	M. Walker	Wallace	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3564.000	Mrs.	Kristina	Lamons	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3565.000	Ms.	Madelaine	Moir	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3566.000	Mr.	Brian	Field	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3567.000	Mr.	Garry	Taroli	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3568.000	Mrs.	Jeanne	Hayes	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3569.000	Ms.	Trish	Stevens	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3570.000	Ms.	Irene	Tovar	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3571.000	Mr.	Bruce	Mcgraw	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3572.000	Mrs.	Destiny	Pannell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3573.000	Ms.	Hilarie	Ericson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3574.000	Miss	Sandra	Schaefer	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3575.000	Mr.	Michael	Schuessler	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3576.000	Ms.	Danielle	Tran	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3577.000	Dr.	Eva	Sargent	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3578.000	Ms.	Georgia	Mattingly	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3579.000	Mr.	Donald	Hyatt	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3580.000	Ms.	Nicole	Tourgee	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3581.000	Dr.	Robert	Mitchell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3582.000	Mr.	Rick	Harris	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3583.000	Mr.	Danny	Mullane	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3584.000	Ms.	Fay	Payton	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3585.000	Mr.	Andrew	Wynne	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3586.000	Mr.	Steve	Aydelott	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3587.000	Ms.	Dani	Duran	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3588.000	Ms.	Julie	Sanford	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3589.000	Mr.	Charles	Noble	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3590.000	Mrs.	Marilynn	Byrne Graziano	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3591.000	Ms.	Rachelle	Henderson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3592.000	Mr.	Robert	Jones	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3593.000	Mrs.	Maureen	Pisani	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3594.000	Mrs.	Derrelle	Gable	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3595.000	Ms.	Roz	Goldstein	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3596.000	Mr.	Michel	Polo	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3597.000	Mr.	Marc	Fried	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3598.000	Mr.	David	Lowe	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3599.000	Mrs.	Vicky	Crampton	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3600.000	Mr.	Jay	Blue	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3601.000	Ms.	Karen	Ausfahi	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3602.000	Ms.	Doris	Lein	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3603.000	Mrs.	Ann	Seip	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3604.000	Mr.	Chris	Keefe	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3605.000	Mr.	William	Sweetling	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3606.000	Mr.	Yip	Yuen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3607.000	Ms.	Janet	Yasenchak-Votta	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3608.000	Ms.	Meghan	Natzke	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3609.000	Dr.	Frank	Thorp	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3610.000	Mr.	Stephen	Rebello	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3611.000	Mr.	Bob	Miller	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3612.000	Mr.	Samuel	Goodwin-Walton	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3613.000	Mr.	Mark	Kapac	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3614.000	Mr.	Gerald	Shaia	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3615.000	Mr.	Richard	Fante	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3616.000	Mr.	Brian	Baltin	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3617.000	Ms.	Sheila	Doran-Benyon	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3618.000	Mrs.	Sesame	Fowler	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3619.000	Ms.	Samantha	Meyers	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3620.000	Ms.	Barbara	Ryland	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3621.000	Mr.	James	Lowe	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3622.000	Dr.	Silvio	Fittipaldi	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3623.000	Ms.	Berenice	Cedillo	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3624.000	Mrs.	Geraldine	May	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3625.000	Dr.	Virginia	Bennett	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3626.000	Mrs.	Jessica	Czerezska	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3627.000	Mr.	Gary	Kuehnappel	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3628.000	Ms.	Jerrilynn	Tzakis	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3629.000	Mr.	Carroll	Dartez	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3630.000	Mr.	John	Schreiber	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3631.000	Mr.	Stephen	Bartlett-Re	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3632.000	Mrs.	Brenda	Eisenhart	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3633.000	Mr.	Douglas	Lass	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3634.000	Mrs.	Heather	Valderrama	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3635.000	Mrs.	Nicolette	Ludolphi	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3636.000	Ms.	Beverly	Williams	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3637.000	Mr.	Budd	Berkman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3638.000	Miss	Tara	Lulla	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3639.000	Mr.	Theo	Seavert	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3640.000	Ms.	Susan	Schlosser	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3641.000	Ms.	Janet	Forman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3642.000	Mr.	Brian	Mitchell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3643.000	Ms.	Catherine	Leslie	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3644.000	Mr.	Peter	Spuhler	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3645.000	Mr.	Phillip	Mitchell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3646.000	Mrs.	Joyce	Schwartz	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3647.000	Ms.	Andrea	F.	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3648.000	Ms.	Jane	Davidson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3649.000	Miss	Lisa	Mikolich	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3650.000	Mrs.	Carol	Thompson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3651.000	Ms.	Cecilia	Novero	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3652.000	Ms.	Carol	Hoke	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3653.000	Mr.	John	Dalla	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3654.000	Ms.	Julie	Glenn	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3655.000	Ms.	Lynette	Ridder	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3656.000	Mr.	Stephen	Bailey	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3657.000	Mr.	David	Nichols	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3658.000	Mr.	Joseph	Klimovitz	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3659.000	Mrs.	Jennifer	Bentzel	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3660.000	Mr.	Joseph	Brown	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3661.000	Mr.	Christopher	Lee	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3662.000	Mr.	Dan	Esposito	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3663.000	Ms.	Elizabeth	Nipper	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3664.000	Ms.	Jean	Thompson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3665.000	Mrs.	Sharron	Powell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3666.000	Ms.	Ruby	Mitchell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3667.000	Mrs.	Doris	Davis	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3668.000	Mrs.	Maggi	Hall	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3669.000	Ms.	Carolina	Kormann	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3670.000	Dr.	Lois	Kral	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3671.000	Ms.	Shelly	Wallace	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3672.000	Dr.	Gavin	Dillard	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3673.000	Ms.	Doris	Potter	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3674.000	Ms.	Julie	Jensen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3675.000	Mr.	Bill	Beaudin	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3676.000	Mrs.	Jennifer	Valentine	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3677.000	Ms.	Pamylle	Greinke	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3678.000	Mr.	Scott	Walsh	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3679.000	Ms.	Gloria	La Fleur	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3680.000	Mr.	Dylan	Croft	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3681.000	Dr.	Susan	Morgan	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3682.000	Mrs.	Glory	Urbina	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3683.000	Mrs.	Phyllis	Park	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3684.000	Ms.	Tierney	Grinavic	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3685.000	Ms.	Katherine	Leahy	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3686.000	Ms.	Birgit	Walch	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3687.000	Mrs.	Barbara	Williams	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3688.000	Ms.	Anne	Henry	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3689.000	Ms.	Jessica	Cresseveur	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3690.000	Ms.	A	Todd	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3691.000	Mrs.	Melissa	Hillen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3692.000	Ms.	Marie	Marshall	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3693.000	Ms.	Jan	Mccreary	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3694.000	Ms.	Dianne	Richardson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3695.000	Ms.	Raya	Engler	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3696.000	Mrs.	Chris	Kiefer	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3697.000	Mrs.	Sharon	Johnson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3698.000	Mr.	Russell	Sheppard	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3699.000	Dr.	Dar	Bertsch	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3700.000	Ms.	Sandra	Jackson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3701.000	Ms.	A	Kasbarian	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3702.000	Ms.	Lisa	Riener	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3703.000	Ms.	Sandi	Walters	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3704.000	Mr.	Dinda	Evans	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3705.000	Ms.	KC	Carney	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3706.000	Ms.	Jean	Slocum	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3707.000	Ms.	Silvia	Dacunha	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3708.000	Mr.	Mark and Janet	Thew	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3709.000	Mr.	Daniel	Chase	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3710.000	Mr.	Robert	Rogan	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3711.000	Mr.	Gill	Fahrenwald	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3712.000	Ms.	Rebecca	Harmon	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3713.000	Mr.	Benoit	Drappeau	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3714.000	Mr.	Drew	Kerr	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3715.000	Ms.	Emilie	Vardaman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3716.000	Ms.	Mary Jo	Brinker	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3717.000	Mrs.	Marcia	Liotard	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3718.000	Ms.	Tara	Chambers	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3719.000	Mrs.	Nancy	Schuhrke	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3720.000	Ms.	Linda Sue	Hope	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3721.000	Mrs.	Susan	Rios	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3722.000	Mrs.	Sue	Wilkin	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3723.000	Ms.	Tina	Wilson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3724.000	Mr.	Dwight	Fellman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3725.000	Ms.	Marilynn	Waltasti	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3726.000	Mrs.	Clemen	Devar	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3727.000	Mr.	Bob	Standish	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3728.000	Mr.	Nick	Evans	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3729.000	Ms.	P	Scoville	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3730.000	Mrs.	Susan	Alcorn Lobato	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3731.000	Ms.	Deborah	Walsh	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3732.000	Mr.	Doug	Troup	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3733.000	Ms.	Tina	Florell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3734.000	Mrs.	Vic	Bostock	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3735.000	Mr.	David	Ross	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3736.000	Mr.	Richard	Berggren	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3737.000	Mrs.	Emily	Gross	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3738.000	Mrs.	Jeaneen	Andretta	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3739.000	Ms.	Heidi	Ahlstrand	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3740.000	Mr.	Jacob	Davis	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3741.000	Ms.	Patricia	Paul	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3742.000	Ms.	Betty	Alexander	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3743.000	Ms.	Kirsten	Lear	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3744.000	Mr.	Geraldine	Burnham	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3745.000	Mr.	Gary	Gilardi	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3746.000	Mr.	Van	Vives	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3747.000	Mrs.	Sheri	Cutright	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3748.000	Mrs.	Nina	Reid	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3749.000	Ms.	Susan	Messerschmitt	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3750.000	Ms.	Barbara	Sultan	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3751.000	Mr.	Richard	Espuga	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3752.000	Ms.	Dawn	Serra	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3753.000	Mrs.	Lee	Patrizzi	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3754.000	Ms.	Martha	Ennis	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3755.000	Ms.	Judy	Lubow	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3756.000	Ms.	Sandra	Kaplan	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3757.000		Rachel	Corley	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3758.000	Ms.	Chris	Ottosen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3759.000	Ms.	Yvonne	Fast	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3760.000	Ms.	Laura	Sneddon	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3761.000	Dr. Rev	Curt	Miner	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3762.000	Ms.	Donna	Lober	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3763.000	Mrs.	Kelly	Byrnes	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3764.000	Mrs.	Judy	Fisher	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3765.000	Ms.	Gloria	Korhonen Op	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3766.000	Mr.	Jonathan	Henderson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3767.000	Mr.	Patrick	Whalen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3768.000	Ms.	Judith	Smith	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3769.000	Ms.	Tegwin	Moye	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3770.000	Ms.	Sheila	Spencer	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3771.000	Mrs.	Margaret	Snowden	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3772.000	Dr.	Teresa	Wlosowicz	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3773.000	Ms.	Kim	Haley	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3774.000	Mr.	Kevin	Gaither-Banchoff	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3775.000	Mrs.	Roberta	Page	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3776.000	Mr.	Kenneth	Hollman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3777.000	Mr.	Edward Edward	Dwyer	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3778.000	Miss	Michelle	Moshea	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3779.000	Ms.	Vicky	Moraiti	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3780.000	Mrs.	Jodi	Messenich	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	I am "furious" that the Office of Surface Mining has rejected	
3781.000	Mrs.	Jana	Momin	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3782.000	Ms.	Natalie A	Carter	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3783.000	Ms.	Cindy	Moczamey	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3784.000	Ms.	Janna	Piper	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3785.000	Ms.	Kristine	Blanco-Hallman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3786.000	Mrs.	Sandy	Lee	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3787.000	Mrs.	Sarah	Barton-King	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3788.000	Mr.	Joseph	Collins	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3789.000	Ms.	Dyan	Oldenburg	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3790.000	Ms.	AnnMarie	Wilson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3791.000	Ms.	Cynthia	Thomas	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3792.000	Mr.	Jeremy	Peterson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3793.000	Mr.	Barry	Spielvogel	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3794.000	Ms.	Mary Jo	Quimby	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3795.000	Ms.	Cathy	Crum	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3796.000	Ms.	Laura	Hanks	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3797.000	Ms.	Estefania	Valencia	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3798.000	Ms.	Laura Ann	Bernstein	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3799.000	Dr.	Barbara	Beierl	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3800.000	Mrs.	Monique	Maas	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3801.000	Mrs.	Kim	Clemens	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3802.000	Miss	Nathalie	Quesnel	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3803.000	Mr.	Edward	Campbell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3804.000	Ms.	Diane	Bugliarelli	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3805.000	Mrs.	Elizabeth	Poole	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3806.000	Mr.	David	Humphrey	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3807.000	Ms.	Debi	Bergsma	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3808.000	Mr.	John	Long	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3809.000	Mr.	Darby	Brown	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3810.000	Ms.	Martha	Miller	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3811.000	Ms.	Elizabeth	Guthrie	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3812.000	Mr.	Dan	Struble	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3813.000	Mr.	Darren	Skotnes	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3814.000	Mrs.	Laura	Levey	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3815.000	Ms.	Gwen	Lyndsong	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3816.000	Mr.	Joe	Rissetto	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3817.000	Mrs.	Robyn	Burt	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3818.000	Ms.	Jasmina	Bricic	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3819.000	Mr.	Brett	Haverstick	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3820.000	Mr.	Michael	Masley	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3821.000	Mr.	Bruce	Berger	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3822.000		Susan	Chaney	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3823.000	Ms.	Margaret	Rigsby	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3824.000	Mr.	Clyde II	Williams	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3825.000	Ms.	Mary	Hoff	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3826.000	Mr.	Donald	Shaw	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3827.000	Ms.	Cheryl	Vigoda	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3828.000		Pam	Zoline	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3829.000	Mr.	Douglas	Spaeth	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3830.000	Ms.	Angela	Orozco	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3831.000	Miss	Tatjana	Patitz	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3832.000	Ms.	Eileen	Perahia	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3833.000	Ms.	Dee	Kowalski	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3834.000	Mr.	Donald	Smith	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3835.000	Ms.	Lindsay	Kvam	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3836.000	Mrs.	Jeanne	Schreurs	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3837.000	Ms.	Mimi	Torchin	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3838.000	Mrs.	Stacey	Wood	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3839.000	Mrs.	Terri	Barreras	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3840.000	Mr.	Shiu	Hung	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3841.000	Mr.	Jesse	Williams	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3842.000	Ms.	Trish	Chaney	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3843.000	Mr.	Nathan	Althausen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3844.000	Ms.	Camile	Getter	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3845.000	Ms.	Veerle	Van de Velde	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3846.000	Mr.	Dale	Riehart	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3847.000	Mr.	Peter	Van Gorp	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3848.000	Dr.	David	Jenkins	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3849.000	Dr.	Daud	John	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3850.000	Mr.	Dominic	Libby	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3851.000	Ms.	Lonna	Richmond	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3852.000	Mrs.	Daniele	Halle	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3853.000	Ms.	Audrey	Fisher	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3854.000	Ms.	Tina	Horowitz	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3855.000	Mr.	Jerry	Kessinger	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3856.000	Mr.	Jeffrey	Hurwitz	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3857.000	Mr.	Robert	Reed	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3858.000	Ms.	Willa	O'Connor	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3859.000	Miss	Wess	Staats	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3860.000	Ms.	Karen	Silva	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3861.000	Mr.	Tony	Menechella	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3862.000	Mr.	O	Ruiz	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3863.000	Ms.	Marie	Honey'jones	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3864.000	Mr.	Gary	Denny	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3865.000	Mr.	Jonathan	Kaufman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3866.000	Miss	Yamuna	Landsberg	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3867.000	Ms.	Melanie	Bobrek	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3868.000	Mr.	Scott	Tucker	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3869.000	Ms.	Wanda	Huelsman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3870.000	Mr.	Todd	Warnke	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3871.000	Mrs.	Barbara	Fite	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3872.000	Mr.	John	Lynch	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3873.000	Mrs.	Silvia	Halle	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3874.000	Mr.	Patrick	Brooks	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3875.000	Mr.	Sterling	Showers	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3876.000	Mrs.	Usha	Gordon	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3877.000	Mr.	Leonard	Zoll	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3878.000	Ms.	Kathleen	Jennings	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3879.000	Ms.	Elizabeth	Enright	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3880.000	Mr.	Joel	Goldblatt	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3881.000	Mr.	Ray	Swiatkowski	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3882.000	Ms.	Mary	Madeco-Smith	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3883.000	Mrs.	Nancy	Weir	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3884.000	Ms.	Linda	Michel White	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3885.000	Ms.	Patti	Walker	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3886.000	Ms.	R.	Kirkpatrick	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3887.000	Ms.	Kat	White	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3888.000	Dr.	Theresa	Sheridan	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3889.000	Ms.	Emma	Spurgin Hussey	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3890.000	Ms.	Rory	Oneill	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3891.000	Mrs.	Jamie	Greer	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3892.000	Mr.	Vafa	Ansarifar	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3893.000	Ms.	Sharon	Gillespie	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3894.000	Ms.	Katrina	Cox	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3895.000	Mr.	Chad	Johnson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3896.000	Mr.	Deke	Gliem	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3897.000	Mr.	Jeffrey	Rattner	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3898.000	Mr.	David	Barlup	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3899.000	Ms.	Sarah	Carpenter	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3900.000	Ms.	Larisa	Garski	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3901.000	Mr.	Herman	Cherney	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3902.000	Mrs.	Ami	Jambusaria	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3903.000	Mr.	Paul	Ramos	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3904.000	Mr.	Lanier	Hines	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3905.000	Mr.	Blaze	Bhence	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3906.000	Dr.	Tristan	Sophia	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3907.000	Mrs.	Isabel	Cohen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3908.000	Ms.	Kathleen	Dougherty	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3909.000	Mrs.	Annie	Peysson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3910.000	Mr.	Sean	Yates	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3911.000	Mrs.	Holly	Cerretani	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3912.000	Mrs.	Ute	Trowell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3913.000	Mr.	Patrick	Libby	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3914.000	Ms.	Janet	Robinson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3915.000	Dr.	Jo Anna	Hebberger	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3916.000	Mrs.	Judy	Moore	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3917.000	Ms.	Patricia	Feury	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3918.000	Ms.	Ginger	Geronimo	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3919.000	Mrs.	Charlene	Boydston	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3920.000	Mr.	William	Cromwick	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3921.000	Dr.	Mark & Susan	Glasser	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3922.000	Mr.	Richard	Creswell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3923.000	Ms.	Janice	St Marie	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3924.000	Ms.	Dorothea	Paiva	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3925.000	Ms.	Zada	Rose	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3926.000	Mr.	Ronald	Hobbs	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3927.000	Mr.	Stephan	Donovan	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3928.000	Ms.	Cindy	Tejeda	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3929.000	Mr.	Steven	Stapp	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3930.000	Mrs.	Rudolf	Galindo	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3931.000	Mr.	Ronald	Kestler	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3932.000	Ms.	Alexis	Papoulatos	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3933.000	Mr.	Robert J	Barnhart	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3934.000	Mr.	Chris	Drumright	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3935.000	Ms.	Sue	Pienciak	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter	
3936.000	Ms.	Lula	Kay (Katie) Ingham	WildEarth Guardians	7/1/2014	same form letter <i>I VERY STRONGLY SUPPORT THE LETTER BELOW</i>	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3937.000	Ms.	Deborah	Smith	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter <i>HOW STUPID!!!!</i>	
3938.000	Ms.	Jane	Fritz	WildEarth Guardians	6/27/2014	same form letter <i>I spent three seasons working with youth of the Navajo Nation in Kayenta, Arizona and Navajo Mountain, Utah. I am very familiar with the pollution coming from coal mining operations in the Four Corners area. It's deplorable and because of poverty, the Navajo Nation embraces this dirty coal employment opportunity, but they hate it.</i> <i>I am disappointed that the Office of Surface Mining has rejected any alternative that would provide for the transition of the Four Corners power plant from coal to clean energy. Haven't we put Native peoples at odds with their strong connection to nature and Father Sky and Mother Earth long enough? I think so!</i>	
3939.000	Ms.	Connie	Ball	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter <i>So, are you willing to put those you love where the Four Corners Power Plant discharges pollutants? No? Then why ask others to put up with that pollution? And what about the enormous quantities of water required when there's a severe drought in the Southwest?</i>	Water used at the FCPP and Navajo Mine is provided via Water Right permits which were granted in the 1960s, as discussed in Section 4.5 of the Draft EIS.
3940.000	Mrs.	Mariel	Johnson	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter <i>I am disappointed that the Office of Surface Mining has rejected any alternative that would provide for the transition of the Four Corners power plant from coal to clean energy.</i>	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives.
3941.000	Mrs.	Gail	Blatt	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter <i>I fail to understand why the Office of Surface Mining has rejected any alternative that would provide for the transition of the Four Corners power plant from coal to clean energy.</i>	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives.
3942.000	Mr.	Billy	Angus	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter <i>Fossil fuel has no place in this century and beyond!</i>	
3943.000	Ms.	Janice	Clark	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter <i>We simply must address global warming now. It is already too late for disastrous consequences.</i> <i>The planet belongs to all of us, so your irresponsibility in this regard is reprehensible.</i>	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3944.000	Ms.	Jane	Beattie	WildEarth Guardians	6/26/2014	same form letter <i>Please transition the Four Corners power plant from coal to clean energy. Stop undermining national efforts to combat climate change and cultivate clean energy. Please, adopt a No Action Alternative that will ensure a full transition from coal at the Four Corners Power Plant.</i>	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives. OSMRE is considering all alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIS, including the No Action Alternative, and will publish its decision in the Record of Decision in spring 2015.
3945.000	Ms.	Jade	Golden	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter <i>"Not to hurt our humble brethren is our first duty to them but to stop there is not enough. We have a higher mission to be of service to them whenever they require it." St. Francis of Assisi.</i>	
3946.000	Ms.	Susan	Beard	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter <i>To continue such monster type energy producers can only end in bad bad news for us all.</i>	
3947.000	Mr. and Mrs.	Laurence and Christine	Taylor	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter <i>Ban bios shit now and do your godDamn Jobs.</i>	Please see Master Response #2, Renewable Energy Alternatives.
3948.000	Dr.	Abbie	Ghini	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter <i>Hey! We are downwind here!!! So is the rest of the world, for that matter. Don't use excuses like "more jobs" to poop in your own backyard.</i>	
3949.000	Ms.	Tena	Scruggs	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter <i>We don't want this!</i>	
3950.000	Mr.	James	Thompson	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter <i>Who the bloody hell do you think you are? I demand that you use that authority to adopt a No Action Alternative that would reject more coal mining given the significant threat that it poses to our climate, our health, and our nation. I demand that the Office of Surface Mining stop undermining our national efforts to combat climate change and cultivate clean energy. I demand that you adopt a No Action Alternative that will ensure a full transition from coal at the Four Corners Power Plant.</i>	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives. OSMRE is considering all alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIS, including the No Action Alternative, and will publish its decision in the Record of Decision in spring 2015.
3951.000	Mr.	Marilyn & Tom	Finnelli	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter <i>do it,,</i>	
3952.000	Ms.	Amy	Harlib	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter <i>NO MORE COAL!</i>	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3953.000	Mrs.	Denise	Bowland	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter <i>YES, THANK YOU!!!!</i>	
3954.000	Ms.	Frans	Fulwiler	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter <i>As someone who is greatly concerned about climate change, I am disappointed that the Office of Surface Mining has rejected any...</i>	Climate change is addressed in Section 4.2 of the Draft EIS. Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives
3955.000	Mrs.	Joan	Walker	WildEarth Guardians	7/15/2014	same form letter "I am <i>extremely</i> disappointed that the Office of Surface Mining has rejected..." "I <i>strongly</i> urge the Office of Surface Mining to stop undermining..."	
3956.000	Dr.	Joy	Schochet	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter <i>It is unbelievable that today, with all of the information we have about coal and the deleterious consequences of its usage, we continue to encourage its use in energy creation. We cannot continue to approve "just one more" coal-burning project in this country. We can and must say "NO" to using coal to generate energy and if we have to pay more for this energy, it will encourage conservation and teach us that our actions have consequences.</i>	Thank you for your comment. OSMRE is considering all alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIS, including the No Action Alternative, and will publish its decision in a Record of Decision in spring 2015.
3957.000	Mr.	Frederick	Mackey	WildEarth Guardians	6/25/2014	same form letter <i>Today I am writing because I am disappointed that the Office of Surface Mining has rejected...</i> <i>Thank you for your thoughtful consideration.</i>	
3958.000	Mr.	Jim	Steitz	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter <i>***The Obama Administration has affirmed that America's compelling national interest lies in curtailing catastrophic global warming. The power of the OSM over this very significant source of carbon pollution within federal jurisdiction must be exercised toward that national interest. Only a 'no-action' alternative that terminates the malicious mining and burning of coal to operate the Four Corners power plant is in the American public interest, and OSM must adopt such a no-action alternative. To reduce global warming is not compatible with a continued executive agency blessing of coal burning within its own facilities. The carbon diet that climate science requires of us must start now, and start at the lowest-hanging fruit of this power plant.***</i>	Thank you for your comment. Climate change is addressed in Section 4.2 of the Draft EIS. OSMRE is considering all alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIS, including the No Action Alternative, and will publish its decision in a Record of Decision in spring 2015.
3959.000	Ms.	Marilyn	Martin	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter first paragraph different: <i>I strongly oppose the Office of Surface Mining's rejection of any alternative that would provide for the transition of the Four Corners power plant from coal to clean energy.</i>	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3960.000	Ms.	Judy	Blaisdell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	<p>same form letter 1st paragraph different: <i>I find it ridiculous that the Office of Surface Mining rejected any alternative that would provide for the transition of the Four Corners power plant from coal to clean energy. What an outrageous thing to do.</i></p> <p>2nd paragraph addition: <i>You come live here and breathe this pollution. It might just change your mind.</i></p> <p>3rd paragraph addition: <i>It is the future of your children too.</i></p>	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives
3961.000	Mr.	Frank	Ackerman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	<p>same form letter Additional paragraph: <i>By approving this you show your complete disregard for the health of native Americans. And show how corrupt you are in enabling the Anti-Democracy, Anti-Americann, corrupt, greedy, lying, coal industry to profit at The expense of US citizens.</i></p>	A human health risk assessment was conducted in support of the Draft EIS preparation. A summary of the results can be found in Section 4.17, Health and Safety. An evaluation of potentially disproportionate impacts to minority and low-income populations is provided in Section 4.11, Environmental Justice.
3962.000	Mrs.	Mayellen	Henry	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	<p>same form letter Additional paragraph: <i>Why on earth does this area need to burn coal. With this much sun and wind surely this is a place that can benefit in every way by changing over.</i></p>	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives
3963.000	Ms.	Ellen	Halbert	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	<p>same form letter Additional paragraph: <i>The Four Corners area is a beautiful but fragile natural area that is entirely antithetical to coal pollution. Please keep the Four Corners clean and moving toward a sustainable future! Thank you.</i></p>	Thank you for your comment.
3964.000	Ms.	Janine	Moore	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	<p>No form letter: <i>The Office of Surface Mining has an opportunity to help communities in American Southwest, including on the Navajo Nation, move beyond fossil fuels and reap the benefits of clean energy. By approving more coal mining and burning, the agency is foreclosing alternatives that would enable such a transition.</i></p> <p><i>I urge the Office of Surface Mining to stop undermining our national efforts to combat climate change and cultivate clean energy. Please, adopt a No Action Alternative that will ensure a full transition from coal at the Four Corners Power Plant. Thank you.</i></p>	Thank you for your comment. Climate change is addressed in Section 4.2 of the Draft EIS. OSMRE is considering all alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIS, including the No Action Alternative, and will publish its decision in a Record of Decision in spring 2015.
3965.000	Mr.	Landon	Hilliard	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Only paragraphs 1, 3, 4, and 6 from form letter	
3966.000	Ms.	Janet	Beattie	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	<p>No form letter: <i>Please transition the Four Corners Power plant from coal to clean energy.</i></p> <p><i>Stop undermining national efforts to combat climate change and cultivate clean energy.</i></p> <p><i>Please, adopt a No Action Alternative for a full transition from coal at the Four Corners Power Plant.</i></p>	Thank you for your comment. Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives. OSMRE is considering all alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIS, including the No Action Alternative, and will publish its decision in a Record of Decision in spring 2015.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3967.000	Miss	Lauren	Haley	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	1st and 6th paragraph only of same form letter	
3968.000	Ms.	Beverly	Walker	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter Additional paragraph: <i>Our government should be helping us stop the destruction of our environment. My taxes should not be supporting industrial pollution. We must change our ways and your agency should be in the forefront of ecological practices. You know it's the better thing to do.</i>	Thank you for your comment.
3969.000	Mr.	Jack	Spallino	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter Additional paragraph: <i>I always thought that in America, nothing was impossible, if we could ever get the greedy sociopaths from trying to convince us they are on our side! No more Coal! What kills me is the fact that there is plenty of room for solar, and Germany just supplied 50% of their electricity from it! Why are we still living in the 20th Century? Is it graft?</i>	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives
3970.000	Mr.	AJ	Averett	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter Paragraphs 2, 4, 5, and 6 plus additional: <i>From cradle to grave, coal is THE dirtiest energy source we have. The Office of Surface Mining has authority to reject applications for new coal mining permits, and I urge you to use that authority to adop a No Action Alternative that would REJECT more coal mining, given the proven significant threat that it poses to our climate, our health, our nation and the entire planet.</i> <i>Having driven through the region regularly on my way from the Northeast to California (and back), I have seen this plant many times, and am extremely disappointed that the Office of Surface Mining has rejected any alternative that would provide for the transition of the Four Corners power plant from coal to clean, safe, abundant and sustainable energy (the source-cost of which is identically zero).</i>	Thank you for your comment. Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives. OSMRE is considering all alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIS, including the No Action Alternative, and will publish its decision in a Record of Decision in spring 2015.
3971.000	Ms.	Judith	Castiano	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter Additional paragraph: <i>ONCE AGAIN PROFITS ARE MORE IMPORTANT THAN THE KILLING OF HUMANS, NONHUMANS AND PLANTS! OUR PLANET IS BEING DESTROYED, RAPED, PILLAGED AND MAKE INTO ONE HUGE GARBAGE HEAP ALL FOR THE SAKE OF \$\$\$\$\$\$. INSTEAD OF COLLUDING WITH THE INDUSTRY AND THROWING THE LIVING BEINGS WHO WILL DIE UNDER THE BUS, WHY DON'T YOU DO YOUR JOB!!!</i>	Thank you for your comment
3972.000	Ms.	Barbara	Griffith	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter Additional language to Paragraph 5: <i>What is needed in this area is a fully gas powered power plant that would eliminate much of the carbon pollution that pours from these smoke stacks. The air around this plant would clear up so you could actually see the next hill over.</i>	Please see Master Response #2, Alternatives

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3973.000	Ms.	Patricia	Conkel	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter There is additional language at the beginning of the first paragraph, but it is cut off. Can only see this much: <i>there is no time for staying in this destructive rut.</i>	
3974.000	Mrs.	Mary	Able	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter Additional paragraph: <i>Truly, what can you people be thinking??? The science is there...it is undeniable. Not to transition from coal to clean energy is simply amoral, unethical and unconscionable.</i>	
3975.000	Mr.	Marcus	Lanskey	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter Different first paragraph: <i>We've had enough dirty air and carbon pollution from the Four-corners of our state. I am disappointed that the Office of Surface Mining has rejected any alternative that would provide for the transition of the Four Corner power plant from coal to clean energy.</i>	
3976.000	Mrs.	Eve	Duplissis	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter Different first paragraph: <i>I am saddened that the Office of Surface Mining has rejected any alternative that would provide for the transition of the Four Corners power plant from coal to clean energy.</i>	
3977.000	Mr.	Douglas	Deaton	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter Paragraphs 1, 2, and last sentence from last paragraph of form letter.	
3978.000	Ms.	M	Langelan		6/24/2014	Same form letter additional language: <i>I am "very" disappointed that the Office of Surface Mining has rejected...</i>	
3979.000	Ms.	Donna	Smith		6/24/2014	same form letter, additional language: <i>Having treasured the opportunity to participate in the archaeological digs at Crow Canyon, I value both the historic importance of this region and also the present value of air quality. As a nation we must protect our country from air pollution, such as that from coalpowered plants.</i>	
3980.000	Mr.	Dave and Rita	Cross		6/24/2014	Same form letter, additional language: "We: are disappointed that the Office of Surface Mining has rejected..."	
3981.000	Ms.	Rebecca	Tippens		6/24/2014	same form letter, additional language: <i>I am "VERY" disappointed that the Office of Surface Mining has rejected...</i>	
3982.000	Ms.	Andrea	Bowen		6/24/2014	same form letter, additional language: <i>Coal harms US health, look at China where coal pollution is killing millions a year.</i>	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3983.000	Mrs.	Polly	Tarpley		6/24/2014	<p>same form letter, additional language:</p> <p><i>My consistent response, when being presented with idiocy like this is "follow the lobbying money!" It certainly appears to be the case in this problem. The solution is obvious, and yet the "responsible" parties involved are going in the opposite direction! HMMMMM!</i></p>	
3984.000	Mr.	Charles	Fox		6/24/2014	<p>same form letter, additional language:</p> <p><i>There is no excuse for promoting the extraction of coal anywhere, anytime. Coal is the dirtiest, most climate disrupting fuel in existence and it's use must be phased out immediately. Stop threatening our national security and our futures. I am extremely disappointed...</i></p>	
3985.000	Mr.	Larry	Lambeth		6/24/2014	<p>same form letter, additional language:</p> <p><i>Stop the Four Corners power plant pollution of the southwest which adversely affects native Americans, poisons our water, pollutes our air and emits greenhouse gases! I am disappointed that the Office of Surface Mining has rejected any alternative that would provide for the transition of the Four Corners power plant from coal to clean energy.</i></p> <p><i>Their are far better alternatives than coal! Under your proposal, the Four Corners power plant would be supplied with coal for decades longer, fueling carbon pollution and contamination in a region that has long suffered from the ill effects of dirty energy.</i></p> <p><i>I urge the Office of Surface Mining you to reject more coal mining permits. Use your authority to protect our citizens, our environment and our future; adopt a No Action Alternative that would reject more coal mining given the damage it inflicts and the significant threat that it poses to our climate, our health, and our nation.</i></p> <p><i>In light of President Obama's call for carbon reductions nationwide, the Office of Surface Mining must recognize the fact that a decision for permits will enable nearly 10 million tons of unmitigated carbon pollution and billions of dollars of damage annually.</i></p> <p><i>The Office of Surface Mining has an opportunity to help communities in American Southwest, including the Navajo Nation, move beyond fossil fuels and benefit from clean energy. By approving more coal mining and burning, the agency is blocking alternatives that would enable a better future with clean energy.</i></p> <p><i>I urge the Office of Surface Mining to stop undermining our national efforts to combat climate change and cultivate clean energy. Please, adopt a No Action Alternative that will ensure a full transition from coal at the Four Corners Power Plant. Support the President and the EPA and put citizens before corporate profits and polluters schemes.</i></p>	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3986.000	Ms.	Amy	Carpenter	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	<p>same form letter, additional language:</p> <p><i>I am extremely dismayed that the Office of Surface Mining has rejected any alternative that would provide for the transition of the Four Corners power plant from coal to clean energy.</i></p> <p><i>This is obviously more of the same old story: the assumption that because this area is one of extreme poverty it will gladly compromise the health of the environment and the health of its population in the name of more jobs. This is a classic class warfare situation and New Mexicans need to object to more sacrifices being asked of the poor for the enrichment of a privileged upper class few. Enough!!! What we need to demand is environmentally friendly job creation for this area in New Mexico...the wind and solar energy fields, in particular.</i></p>	
3987.000	Mr.	Sanford	Brown	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	<p>same form letter, additional language:</p> <p><i>What are you? the ANTIEnvironmental Protection Agency???</i></p>	
3988.000	Ms.	MaryAnn	Peters	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	<p>same form letter, additional language:</p> <p><i>How can the Office of Surface Mining so blatantly reject any alternative that would provide for the transition of the Four Corners power plant from coal to clean energy? Are you saying that there exists NO ALTERNATIVE to more dirty emissions from the use of coal?</i></p>	
3989.000	Mr.	Michael	Farrell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	<p>same form letter, additional language:</p> <p><i>I am extremely disappointed that the Office of Surface Mining has rejected any alternative that would provide for the transition of the Four Corners power plant from coal to clean energy.</i></p> <p><i>The Office of Surface Mining can't simply turn a blind eye to the fact that is decision will enable nearly 10 million tons of carbon pollution annually.</i></p>	
3990.000	Ms.	Katherine	Delanoy	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	<p>same form letter, additional language:</p> <p><i>I am truly upset that the Office of Surface Mining has rejected any alternative that would provide for the transition of the Four Corners power plant from coal to clean energy. Do you really want the Four Corners power plant to be supplied with coal for decades longer, fueling carbon pollution and contamination in a region that has long suffered from the ill effects of dirty energy? The Office of Surface Mining has authority to reject applications for new coal mining permits. I urge you to use that authority to adopt a No Action Alternative that would reject more coal mining given the significant threat that it poses to our climate, our health, our nation, my state, and my daughter, who lives downwind of that area. How can you turn a blind eye to the fact that is decision will enable nearly 10 million tons of carbon pollution annually? The Office of Surface Mining has an opportunity to help communities in American Southwest to move beyond fossil fuels and reap the benefits of clean</i></p>	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p><i>energy. By approving more coal mining and burning, the agency is foreclosing alternatives that would enable such a transition. I urge the Office of Surface Mining to stop undermining our national efforts to combat climate change and cultivate clean energy.</i></p> <p><i>Please, adopt a No Action Alternative that will ensure a full transition from coal at the Four Corners Power Plant. Thank you.</i></p>	
3991.000	Mr.	Bernard	Cullen	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	<p>same form letter, additional language:</p> <p><i>I live in North Central New Mexico; Edgewood. Please do not infect my neighborhood with soot, carbon emissions and other pollutants. The era of coal is over; coal is the only energy sector that is not engaged in bolstering its business model with other sources of energy. We use solar primarily with some gas and within a few years we will rely solely on solar and wind.</i></p>	
3992.000	Mrs.	Pamela	Griesser	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	<p>same form letter, additional language:</p> <p><i>I am VERY disappointed that the Office of Surface Mining has rejected any alternative that would provide for the transition of the Four Corners power plant from coal to clean energy. YOU DON'T LIKE CLEAN ENERGY? WHY?</i></p>	
3993.000	Dr.	James	Lazell	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	<p>same form letter, additional language:</p> <p><i>I am an environmental scientist disappointed that the Office of Surface Mining has rejected any alternative that would provide for the transition of the Four Corners power plant from coal to clean energy. Under your proposal, the Four Corners power plant would be supplied with coal for decades longer, ueling carbon pollution and contamination in a region that has long suffered rom the ill effects of dirty energy.</i></p>	
3994.000	Mrs.	Yolanda	Garcia	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	<p>same form letter, additional language:</p> <p><i>As a lifelong resident of New Mexico, I highly resent this action!</i></p> <p><i>As you are aware, the Office of Surface Mining has authority to reject applications for new coal mining permits. I urge you to use that authority to adopt a No Action Alternative that would reject more coal mining given the significant threat that it poses to our climate, our health, and our nation. This must be done! In light of President Obama's call for carbon reductions nationwide, the Office of Surface Mining can't act so carelessly and imprudently, enabling nearly 10 million tons of carbon pollution annually.</i></p> <p><i>The Office of Surface Mining has an opportunity, a responsibility, to help communities in the Southwest, including on the Navajo Nation, move beyond fossil fuels and reap the benefits of clean energy. By approving more coal mining and burning, the agency is foreclosing alternatives that would enable such a transition. They are contradicting their responsibilities.</i></p>	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
3995.000	Mrs.	Bethany	Birnbaum	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	I remember when my children's school was heated with coal. Asthma attacks were frequent, the children and teachers had headaches, eye problems, and coughing. Everything was covered with black oily filth. Multiply this by the effects of a power plant burning coal, in addition to the destruction of mining it, and it shows our nation as stupid, greed, and self destructive. It has to stop.	Thank you for your comment.
3996.000	Dr.	Susan	Robinson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter, additional language: <i>Please, adopt a No Action Alternative that will ensure a full transition from coal at the Four Corners Power Plant. Thank you.</i>	
3997.000	Ms.	Kathryn	Dalenberg	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter, additional language: <i>Are you idiots? I am disgusted that the Office of Surface Mining has rejected any alternative that would provide for the transition of the Four Corners power plant from coal to clean energy.</i>	
3998.000	Ms.	Judy	Merrick	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter, additional language: <i>There is no such thing as "can't say no". You most certainly can say "no" to coal power plants.</i>	
3999.000	Ms.	Constance	Pepin	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter, additional language: <i>I am "very" disappointed... "Especially" in light of President Obama's...</i>	
4000.000	Ms.	Sue	Stoudemire	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	same form letter, additional language: <b>NO NO NO NO NO TO COAL MINING!</b> <i>REVERS YOUR POSITION. I am INFURIATED that the Office of Surface Mining has rejected any alternative that would transition the Four Corners power plant from coal to clean energy.</i> <i>The Office of Surface Mining has authority to reject applications for new coal mining permits.</i> <i>I urge you to use your authority to adopt a No Action Alternative that rejects more coal mining!</i> <i>Please take seriously the significant threat to our climate, our health, and our nation.</i> <i>In light of President Obama's call for carbon reductions nationwide, the Office of Surface Mining can't simply turn a blind eye to the fact that is decision will enable ALMOST 10 MILLION TONS OF CARBON POLLUTION A YEAR!</i> <b>UNACCEPTABLE!</b>	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
4001.000	Ms.	Nancy	Shinn	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	<p>same form letter, additional language:</p> <p><i>My husband and I are upset and disgusted that the Office of Surface Mining as rejected any alternative that would provide for the transition of the Four orners power plant from coal to clean energy.</i></p>	
4002.000	Ms.	Maggie	Schafer	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	<p>DIRTY SALLY IS ALL ABOUT ENERGY AND WILL SELL OUT EVERYTHING TO POLITICS AND SPECIAL INTERESTS! STOP THE RAPE OF AMERICAN AND STOP THE PERSECUTION OF WILDLIFE!</p>	Thank you for your comment.
4003.000	Mr.	Alwyn	Jones	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	<p>same form letter, additional language:</p> <p><i>Under your proposal, the Four Corners power plant would be supplied with coal for decades longer, fueling carbon pollution and contamination in a egion that has long suffered from the ill effects of dirty energy.</i></p> <p><i>In light of President Obama’s call for carbon reductions nationwide, the Office of Surface Mining can’t simply turn a blind eye to the fact that is decision will enable nearly 10 million tons of carbon pollution annually.</i></p> <p><i>I urge the Office of Surface Mining to stop undermining our national efforts to combat climate change and cultivate clean energy. Please, adopt a No ction Alternative that will ensure a full transition from coal at the Four orners Power Plant. Thank you.</i></p>	
4004.000	Mrs.	Pamela	Bolton	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	<p>same form letter, additional language:</p> <p><i>Our planet, and its people, cannot survive if something isn’t done about the ollution filling our air and earth. End the coal usage and insist that a cleaner ource be found. We have but one planet. If we destroy it, where will we go??</i></p>	
4005.000	Mr.	Alex	Keir	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	<p>same form letter, additional language:</p> <p><i>I am “more than” disappointed...</i></p>	
4006.000	Mr.	Pierre	Schlemel	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	<p>I am GREATLY disappointed that the Office of Surface Mining has REJECTED ANY alternative that would provide for the TRANSITION of the Four Corners power plant from coal to CLEAN energy.</p> <p>Under your proposal, the Four Corners power plant would be supplied with coal for DECADES longer, FUELING carbon pollution AND contamination in a region that has LONG suffered from the ILL effects of dirty energy.</p> <p>The Office of Surface Mining has authority to REJECT applications for new coal mining permits. I STRONGLY urge YOU to USE that authority to adopt a NO ACTION Alternative that would REJECT more coal mining given the SIGNIFICANT threat that it poses to our climate, our health, and our nation.</p>	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
						<p>In light of President Obama’s call for carbon REDUCTIONS nationwide, the Office of Surface Mining CANNOT simply turn a BLIND eye to the FACT that its decision will ENABLE nearly 10 MILLION tons of carbon POLLUTION annually.</p> <p>The Office of Surface Mining has an opportunity to HELP communities in the American Southwest, including on the Navajo Nation, move BEYOND fossil fuels and reap the BENEFITS of clean energy. By approving MORE coal mining and burning, the agency is FORECLOSING alternatives that would ENABLE such a transition.</p> <p>I STRONGLY urge the Office of Surface Mining to STOP undermining our national efforts to COMBAT climate change and cultivate CLEAN energy.</p> <p>Please, ADOPT a NO Action Alternative that will ENSURE a FULL transition from coal at the Four Corners Power Plant. Thank you.</p>	
4007.000	Mr.	Bob	Brister	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	I urge the Office of Surface Mining to stop undermining efforts to combat climate change and cultivate clean energy. Please adopt a No Action Alternative that will ensure a full transition from coal at the Four Corners Power Plant. Thank you.	Thank you for your comment.
4008.000	Mr.	Linc	Cole	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	“This is absolutely absurd! The” Office of Surface Mining has rjected...	
4009.000	Ms.	Doris	Vician	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	We like clean air and blue skies in NM.	
4010.000	Mr.	David	Gustafson	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	am “very” disappointed...	
4011.000	Ms.	Cynthia	Arnold	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	I am “extremely” disappointed...	
4012.000	Mr.	Leon	Trumpp	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Don’t coddle the filthy coal industry . There never is such a thing as clean coal.	
4013.000	Mrs.	Barbara	Rystrom	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Aren’t you concerned about global warming and they possible terrible consequences?	
4014.000	Ms.	Marcella	Crane	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	“I live in AZ and have visited the area and it is downright gross. Even the smog and pollution prevents tourists from fully experiencing the Grand Canyon as the haze can be so bad. So” I am disappointed...	
4015.000	Ms.	Margaret	Haddenman	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	I am “outraged” that the Office of Surface Mining has rejected...	

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
4016.000	Ms.	Elizabeth	Blumenstock	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	We are fast approaching unbelievable climate instability in our world, our only world. We now only have time for the right decisions.	
4017.000	Ms.	Catherine	Heyne	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	<p>I am alarmed that the Office of Surface Mining has rejected all alternatives that would provide for the transition of the Four Corners power plant from coal to clean energy, especially to something like solar.</p> <p>The Office of Surface Mining has authority to reject applications for new coal mining permits. I urge you to use that authority to adopt a No Action Alternative that would reject more coal mining given the significant threat that it poses to our climate, our health, and our nation. Under your current proposal, the Four Corners power plant would be supplied with coal for decades longer, fueling carbon pollution and contamination in a region that has long suffered from the ill effects of dirty energy.</p> <p>In light of President Obama's call for carbon reductions nationwide, the Office of Surface Mining can't simply turn a blind eye to the fact that is decision will enable nearly 10 million tons of carbon pollution annually, not to mention the toxic wastes generated in the form of ash, sludge, toxic chemicals, and heat that create more environmental problems.</p> <p>According to the American Lung Association, 24,000 people a year die prematurely because of pollution from coal-fired power plants. And every year 38,000 heart attacks, 12,000 hospital admissions and an additional 550,000 asthma attacks result from power plant pollution.</p> <p>The Office of Surface Mining has an opportunity to help communities in American Southwest, including on the Navajo Nation, move beyond fossil fuels and reap the benefits of clean energy. By approving more coal mining and burning, the agency is foreclosing alternatives that would enable such a transition.</p> <p>I urge the Office of Surface Mining to stop undermining national efforts to combat climate change and cultivate clean energy. Please, adopt a No Action Alternative that will ensure a full transition from coal at the Four Corners Power Plant. Thank you.</p>	
4018.000	Mr.	Richard	Leonard	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	Interior Dept. and Office of Surface Mining, Have you people totally lost it!!! Have your brains withered away to nothing but Swiss Cheese with no sense responsibility, moral obligation, or consideration of scientific data!!! What is all this dissimilating and outright caving in to lobbyists and mining.!!! I'm amazed that you still walk on only two limbsfour would be more appropriate!!!! RDLeonard	Thank you for your comment.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
4019.000	Ms.	Antonia	Shouse	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	<p>Shocking it is that you have no recognition of the state of our planet, we must have CLEAN ENERGY NOW.</p> <p>WHY has the Office of Surface Mining rejected any alternative for transition of the Four Corners power plant from coal to clean energy.</p> <p>Such mindsets MUST CHANGE. The Office of Surface Mining has authority to reject applications for new coal mining permits. SO, reject more coal mining.</p> <p>Please stop undermining our national efforts to combat climate change and cultivate clean energy. IMMEDIATELY, adopt a No Action Alternative that will ensure a full transition from coal at the Four Corners Power Plant.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Thank you for your comment.
4020.000	Mrs.	Teresa	Seamster	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	<p>EVERY DELAY YOU ALLOW IN THE COMMONSENSE REDUCTION OF CO2 POLLUTION JUST ADDS MORE COST AND MORE DAMAGE TO THE NEXT ENERATION. WHAT DOES IT TAKE TO MAKE YOU RESPONSIBLE AND FINALLY REQUIRE TRANSITION TO CLEAN ENERGY?</p> <p>STOP BEING SO CRAVEN AND TAKE THE SENSIBLE STEPS SO MANY GROUPS AND ORGANIZATIONS HAVE GIVEN YOU TO FOLLOW.</p>	Thank you for your comment. Climate change is addressed in Section 4.2 of the Draft EIS. With regard to renewable energy alternatives, please see Master Response #2, Alternatives.
4021.000	Mr.	John	Burridge	WildEarth Guardians	6/24/2014	I write as a retired chemical engineer well acquainted with the industry and the problems it causes.	Thank you for your comment.
4022.000	Mr.	Howard	John		5/2/2014	<p>I'm concerned that we got three women that got cancer. One of them they buried today and last week and one of them relatives got a cancer too. I just wonder why is that. Is it because of the smog we had for so many years, we can't even see the mountains? Or I don't know what you call this mountain. Hesper's Peak It's a sacred mountain. We hadn't seen Hesper for a long time. I just wonder about the smog, you know. Maybe it's going to kill us all one of these days.</p> <p>It's what I'm thinking about. I don't know. I say, why, why, why. I wonder, how did they get the cancer? That's what I wonder. So many people around here, they got it, you know. That's my main concern. That's it.</p>	Thank you for your comment. A discussion of human health risk assessment conducted for the project is provided in Section 4.17 of the Draft EIS and addresses cancer risk.

Comment #	Title	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Date	Comment	Response
4023.000	Mr.	Vincent	Yazzie		7/11/2014	<p>Four Corners Power Plant needs to implement SMART Grid Technology which PGE did for their system.  <a href="http://www.pge.com/includes/docs/pdfs/shared/edusafety/electric/SmartGridDeploymentPlan2011_06-30-11.pdf">http://www.pge.com/includes/docs/pdfs/shared/edusafety/electric/SmartGridDeploymentPlan2011_06-30-11.pdf</a></p> <p>The Smart Grid will integrate wind and solar supplies to give customers more clean and renewable energy. The Smart Grid will also support more widespread customer adoption of rooftop solar as well as “smart charging” programs that encourage the use of zero emission electric vehicles while helping protect the safety and reliability of the energy grid.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. APS and other owners of FCPP maintain a portfolio of renewable energy sources, in addition to the power produced at FCPP. The decision to integrate SMART Grid Technology or other customer education activities is a business decision that could be implemented at the discretion of the power plant owners and is outside the scope of this EIS.</p>
4024.001	Mr.	Vincent	Yazzie		7/2/2014	<p>Submittal of article titled: “Court blocks coal mine expansion for not counting the costs of carbon pollution.”</p>	<p>A quantitative analysis of the social cost of carbon (SCC) has been added to the Final EIS in Section 4.2. The Draft EIS considered the SCC in a qualitative manner, but did not quantify the effects. Subsequent to issuance of the Draft EIS, CEQ published Draft Guidance on climate change analysis (CEQ 2014), in which CEQ indicates that emissions monetization is not required in every project-level NEPA analysis. Nonetheless, OSMRE determined that a quantitative analysis would be included in the Final EIS, following the Interagency Working Group Methods. The results of the SCC analysis do not change the conclusions or the findings of level of significance for the Climate Change issue; however, the analysis has been added to provide additional context to OSMRE’s decision.</p>