

**State of Alaska – Pebble Project Preliminary Draft EIS, General Comments**

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Section, Paragraph, and Page #</b>	<b>Cooperating Agency Comment (and Purpose of Comment)</b>	<b>Proposed Resolution (Additions or Deletion of Text)</b>	<b>Response</b>
ADF&G	1	General	In general, this document is incomplete, missing sections, references etc.	Further information may be needed to assess the ability to sustain fish and wildlife production when provided with more project details, specifically regarding the transportation corridors.	Comment noted. Revisions have been made throughout the Draft EIS.
ADF&G/ Wildlife/R efuges	2	General	<p>Throughout the documents a common theme is to refer the reader to previous or other chapters or sections for information on the subject that is currently being read. For example, it is common to say Impacts or resources for one alternative are the same or similar as another alternative or site. Or to say as described in Alternative X, when discussing another alternative or variant.</p> <p>This is confusing and does not give the reader any good idea of the importance of resources or the impacts involved in any particular section or alternative. The affected resources and impacts for each alternative, variant and project site should explain in detail within the section that is being discussed.</p>	Explain the affected resources and impacts for each alternative, variant and project site in detail within the section that is being discussed and avoid constantly referring to other sections for the information.	The framework for analysis is presented in Section 4.1, Introduction to Environmental Consequences. Where appropriate to the resources mentioned, the reader is referred to other sections. The document is being developed under recommendations to improve the NEPA process, which involves streamlining content. Analysis that is presented in other places in the document is not repeated.

State of Alaska – Pebble Project Preliminary Draft EIS, General Comments

Agency	Comment No.	Section, Paragraph, and Page #	Cooperating Agency Comment (and Purpose of Comment)	Proposed Resolution (Additions or Deletion of Text)	Response
ADF&G/ Wildlife/Refuges	3	General	<p>Garbage, other industrial attractants and food conditioning of bears or other wildlife caused by operations at facilities and increased access along roadways will cause conflicts and management issues. Project infrastructure, the WMP and any mitigation measures need to assess potential sources of food, garbage, or other wildlife attractants at each facility and along transportation corridors. Incorporate wildlife movement corridors, accessibility, mortality threats, and risks of food conditioning to public safety.</p> <p>Particularly problematic along south road corridor and Amakdedori site as brown bears using these areas utilize McNeil River State Game Sanctuary and McNeil River State Game Refuge. And food conditioning of these bears can cause substantial problems for the State and public safety.</p>	Incorporate requested analysis and information into revised sections of EIS.	<p>Comment acknowledged. These potential impacts have been recognized and included in the DEIS. The implementation of a Wildlife Management Plan would address concerns to the extent feasible, including adaptive management measures should human-wildlife interactions become a problem. The Wildlife Management Plan would be developed by PLP, as indicated in Section 4.23, Wildlife Values, and mentioned in Chapter 5, Mitigation.</p> <p>Section 4.23, Wildlife Values, includes this text: “There would be a potential for bear mortality due to defense of life and property. Bears that become habituated and frequent the mine site, ferry terminals, Amakdedori port, or other project locations, may become a safety risk. Some of these bears may experience hazing and other negative human interactions, and then travel to areas such as Katmai National Park and Preserve and McNeil River State Game Refuge and Sanctuary. Bears that are negatively habituated to the project, or have become food conditioned, may become a danger to the public at bear viewing areas. Implementation of a WMP would be anticipated to minimize the potential for conflict between wildlife and humans.”</p>