

Attachment I
Comments and Responses on
the Final EIS

Public Comments				
Date	Originator	Previously Commented (Yes/No)	Summary of Comments	Response
28-Jul-16	Ken Jongsma	No	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. He opposes the project and believes the BIA is incorrect in dismissing concerns as "not significant" and has the following concerns: 2. He states that there is not a revenue sharing agreement with St. Joseph County. 3. Traffic from the casino will be an issue. 4. The EIS dismisses problem gambling as "not significant" 5. The environmental mitigation will take place in the State of Michigan and not in the community. 6. The EIS dismisses a likely increase in bankruptcies. 7. The BIA dismisses the bankruptcy rates, violent crimes, auto thefts, and larceny increase that comes with the opening of a new casino. 8. The BIA is dismissing wetland impacts as "less than significant." 9. He asks that another hearing be held to address vital issues that have been dismissed. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment noted. 2. Comment noted. 3. Please see Sections 4.8.3.1, 4.8.4.1, and 4.8.5.1 for an analysis of traffic impacts and Section 5.8.1 for mitigation measures related to transportation. 4. Please see Section 4.7.1.5 for explanations of significance criteria related to the potential social costs associated with gambling, and Sections 4.7.3.5, 4.7.4.5, and 4.7.5.6 for an analysis of potential social costs. 5. Mitigation discussed in the FEIS takes place in the State of Indiana and in the community. Please see Sections 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5 for an explanation of the mitigation measures related to land resources, water resources, air quality, and biological resources, respectively. 6. Please see Sections 4.7.1.2 and 4.7.1.6 for explanation of significance criteria related to employment and income and fiscal effects to the County, and Sections 4.7.3.1, 4.7.3.6, 4.7.4.1, and 4.7.4.6 for an analysis of direct economic effects of the project and fiscal effects to the County. 7. Please see Section 4.7.1.5 for explanations of significance criteria related to the potential social costs associated with gambling, and Sections 4.7.3.5, 4.7.4.5, and 4.7.5.6 for an analysis of potential social costs. 8. Please see Section 4.5.1.4 for an explanation of significance criteria related to wetlands and Sections 4.5.3.4, 4.5.4.5, and 4.5.5.4 for an analysis of wetland impacts associated with construction. 9. The BIA has completed all public involvement in accordance with the requirements outlined in the Indian Affairs National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Guidebook (59 IAM 3-H).
28-Jul-16	Jake Teshka	Yes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. He opposes the project and believes the BIA is incorrect in dismissing concerns as "not significant" and has the following concerns: 2. He states that there is not a revenue sharing agreement with St. Joseph County. 3. Traffic from the casino will be an issue. 4. The EIS dismisses problem gambling as "not significant" 5. The environmental mitigation will take place in the State of Michigan and not in the community. 6. The EIS dismisses a likely increase in bankruptcies. 7. The BIA dismisses the bankruptcy rates, violent crimes, auto thefts, and larceny increase that comes with the opening of a new casino. 8. The BIA is dismissing wetland impacts as "less than significant." 9. He asks that another hearing be held to address vital issues that have been dismissed. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment noted. 2. Comment noted. 3. Please see Sections 4.8.3.1, 4.8.4.1, and 4.8.5.1 for an analysis of traffic impacts and Section 5.8.1 for mitigation measures related to transportation. 4. Please see Section 4.7.1.5 for explanations of significance criteria related to the potential social costs associated with gambling, and Sections 4.7.3.5, 4.7.4.5, and 4.7.5.6 for an analysis of potential social costs. 5. Mitigation discussed in the FEIS takes place in the State of Indiana and in the community. Please see Sections 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5 for an explanation of the mitigation measures related to land resources, water resources, air quality, and biological resources, respectively. 6. Please see Sections 4.7.1.2 and 4.7.1.6 for explanation of significance criteria related to employment and income and fiscal effects to the County, and Sections 4.7.3.1, 4.7.3.6, 4.7.4.1, and 4.7.4.6 for an analysis of direct economic effects of the project and fiscal effects to the County. 7. Please see Section 4.7.1.5 for explanations of significance criteria related to the potential social costs associated with gambling, and Sections 4.7.3.5, 4.7.4.5, and 4.7.5.6 for an analysis of potential social costs. 8. Please see Section 4.5.1.4 for an explanation of significance criteria related to wetlands and Sections 4.5.3.4, 4.5.4.5, and 4.5.5.4 for an analysis of wetland impacts associated with construction. 9. The BIA has completed all public involvement in accordance with the requirements outlined in the Indian Affairs National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Guidebook (59 IAM 3-H).
29-Jul-16 and 22-Aug-16	Norm Andrews	No	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. He opposes the project and believes the BIA is incorrect in dismissing concerns as "not significant" and has the following concerns: 2. He states that there is not a revenue sharing agreement with St. Joseph County. 3. Traffic from the casino will be an issue. 4. The EIS dismisses problem gambling as "not significant" 5. The environmental mitigation will take place in the State of Michigan and not in the community. 6. The EIS dismisses a likely increase in bankruptcies. 7. The BIA dismisses the bankruptcy rates, violent crimes, auto thefts, and larceny increase that comes with the opening of a new casino. 8. The BIA is dismissing wetland impacts as "less than significant." 9. He asks that another hearing be held to address vital issues that have been dismissed. 10. He firmly objects to the casino because he has seen the negative effects of the Pine Ridge and Rosebud in Mission, SD on the housing, crime, and appearance of surrounding areas to nearby casinos. 11. He has had to counsel gambling addicts and has seen the damage on families, marriage, and children. 12. He states that the only ones who will profit from the casino are a few key people at the top. 13. He asks to please consider this action. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment noted. 2. Comment noted. 3. Please see Sections 4.8.3.1, 4.8.4.1, and 4.8.5.1 for an analysis of traffic impacts and Section 5.8.1 for mitigation measures related to transportation. 4. Please see Section 4.7.1.5 for explanations of significance criteria related to the potential social costs associated with gambling, and Sections 4.7.3.5, 4.7.4.5, and 4.7.5.6 for an analysis of potential social costs. 5. Mitigation discussed in the FEIS takes place in the State of Indiana and in the community. Please see Sections 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5 for an explanation of the mitigation measures related to land resources, water resources, air quality, and biological resources, respectively. 6. Please see Sections 4.7.1.2 and 4.7.1.6 for explanation of significance criteria related to employment and income and fiscal effects to the County, and Sections 4.7.3.1, 4.7.3.6, 4.7.4.1, and 4.7.4.6 for an analysis of direct economic effects of the project and fiscal effects to the County. 7. Please see Section 4.7.1.5 for explanations of significance criteria related to the potential social costs associated with gambling, and Sections 4.7.3.5, 4.7.4.5, and 4.7.5.6 for an analysis of potential social costs. 8. Please see Section 4.5.1.4 for an explanation of significance criteria related to wetlands and Sections 4.5.3.4, 4.5.4.5, and 4.5.5.4 for an analysis of wetland impacts associated with construction. 9. The BIA has completed all public involvement in accordance with the requirements outlined in the Indian Affairs National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Guidebook (59 IAM 3-H). 10. and 11. Comments have been noted. The BIA has analyzed and considered potential social costs associated with gambling and casino development. Please see Sections 4.7.3.5, 4.7.4.5, and 4.7.5.6 for an analysis of potential social costs. 12. Section 4.7.3.7 identifies the benefits of the development to the Pokagon Band. The project would establish an inalienable land base for the Pokagon Band, provide housing options and a base for community functions, create employment opportunities, enhance Tribal lifestyle and culture, and generate profits for the Pokagon Band. Please see Sections 4.7.3.1, 4.7.3.6, 4.7.4.1, and 4.7.4.6 for an analysis of direct economic effects of the project and fiscal effects to the County. 13. Comment noted.

1-Aug-16	John and Jill Boughton	Yes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They oppose the project and believe the BIA is incorrect in dismissing concerns as "not significant" and have the following concerns: 2. Traffic from the casino will be an issue. 3. Problem gambling is dismissed as "not significant" 4. They want to know how environmental concerns will be mitigated. 5. An increase in bankruptcies is dismissed. 6. The BIA dismisses the bankruptcy rates, violent crimes, auto thefts, and larceny increase that comes with the opening of a new casino. 7. The BIA is dismissing wetland impacts as "less than significant." 8. They ask that another hearing be held to address vital issues that have been dismissed. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment noted. 2. Please see Sections 4.8.3.1, 4.8.4.1, and 4.8.5.1 for an analysis of traffic impacts and Section 5.8.1 for mitigation measures related to transportation. 3. Please see Section 4.7.1.5 for explanations of significance criteria related to the potential social costs associated with gambling, and Sections 4.7.3.5, 4.7.4.5, and 4.7.5.6 for an analysis of potential social costs. 4. Please see Sections 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5 for an explanation of the mitigation measures related to land resources, water resources, air quality, and biological resources, respectively. 5. Please see Sections 4.7.1.2 and 4.7.1.6 for explanation of significance criteria related to employment and income and fiscal effects to the County, and Sections 4.7.3.1, 4.7.3.6, 4.7.4.1, and 4.7.4.6 for an analysis of direct economic effects of the project and fiscal effects to the County. 6. Please see Section 4.7.1.5 for explanations of significance criteria related to the potential social costs associated with gambling, and Sections 4.7.3.5, 4.7.4.5, and 4.7.5.6 for an analysis of potential social costs. 7. Please see Section 4.5.1.4 for an explanation of significance criteria related to wetlands and Sections 4.5.3.4, 4.5.4.5, and 4.5.5.4 for an analysis of wetland impacts associated with construction. 8. The BIA has completed all public involvement in accordance with the requirements outlined in the Indian Affairs National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Guidebook (59 IAM 3-H).
5-Aug-16	Ellen Stanley	Yes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. She opposes the project and believes the BIA is incorrect in dismissing concerns as "not significant" and has the following concerns: 2. She states that there is not a revenue sharing agreement with St. Joseph County. 3. Traffic from the casino will be an issue. 4. The EIS dismisses problem gambling as "not significant." 5. The environmental mitigation will take place in the State of Michigan and not in the community. 6. The EIS dismisses a likely increase in bankruptcies. 7. The BIA dismisses the bankruptcy rates, violent crimes, auto thefts, and larceny increase that comes with the opening of a new casino. 8. The BIA is dismissing wetland impacts as "less than significant." 9. She asks that another hearing be held to address vital issues that have been dismissed. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment noted. 2. Comment noted. 3. Please see Sections 4.8.3.1, 4.8.4.1, and 4.8.5.1 for an analysis of traffic impacts and Section 5.8.1 for mitigation measures related to transportation. 4. Please see Section 4.7.1.5 for explanations of significance criteria related to the potential social costs associated with gambling, and Sections 4.7.3.5, 4.7.4.5, and 4.7.5.6 for an analysis of potential social costs. 5. Mitigation discussed in the FEIS takes place in the State of Indiana and in the community. Please see Sections 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5 for an explanation of the mitigation measures related to land resources, water resources, air quality, and biological resources, respectively. 6. Please see Sections 4.7.1.2 and 4.7.1.6 for explanation of significance criteria related to employment and income and fiscal effects to the County, and Sections 4.7.3.1, 4.7.3.6, 4.7.4.1, and 4.7.4.6 for an analysis of direct economic effects of the project and fiscal effects to the County. 7. Please see Section 4.7.1.5 for explanations of significance criteria related to the potential social costs associated with gambling, and Sections 4.7.3.5, 4.7.4.5, and 4.7.5.6 for an analysis of potential social costs. 8. Please see Section 4.5.1.4 for an explanation of significance criteria related to wetlands and Sections 4.5.3.4, 4.5.4.5, and 4.5.5.4 for an analysis of wetland impacts associated with construction. 9. The BIA has completed all public involvement in accordance with the requirements outlined in the Indian Affairs National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Guidebook (59 IAM 3-H).
13-Aug-16	Martha Byler	No	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. She opposes the project and believes the BIA is incorrect in dismissing concerns as "not significant" and has the following concerns: 2. She states that there is not a revenue sharing agreement with St. Joseph County. 3. Traffic from the casino will be an issue. 4. The EIS dismisses problem gambling as "not significant." 5. The environmental mitigation will take place in the State of Michigan and not in the community. 6. The EIS dismisses a likely increase in bankruptcies. 7. The BIA dismisses the bankruptcy rates, violent crimes, auto thefts, and larceny increase that comes with the opening of a new casino. 8. The BIA is dismissing wetland impacts as "less than significant." 9. She asks that another hearing be held to address vital issues that have been dismissed. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment noted. 2. Comment noted. 3. Please see Sections 4.8.3.1, 4.8.4.1, and 4.8.5.1 for an analysis of traffic impacts and Section 5.8.1 for mitigation measures related to transportation. 4. Please see Section 4.7.1.5 for explanations of significance criteria related to the potential social costs associated with gambling, and Sections 4.7.3.5, 4.7.4.5, and 4.7.5.6 for an analysis of potential social costs. 5. Mitigation discussed in the FEIS takes place in the State of Indiana and in the community. Please see Sections 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5 for an explanation of the mitigation measures related to land resources, water resources, air quality, and biological resources, respectively. 6. Please see Sections 4.7.1.2 and 4.7.1.6 for explanation of significance criteria related to employment and income and fiscal effects to the County, and Sections 4.7.3.1, 4.7.3.6, 4.7.4.1, and 4.7.4.6 for an analysis of direct economic effects of the project and fiscal effects to the County. 7. Please see Section 4.7.1.5 for explanations of significance criteria related to the potential social costs associated with gambling, and Sections 4.7.3.5, 4.7.4.5, and 4.7.5.6 for an analysis of potential social costs. 8. Please see Section 4.5.1.4 for an explanation of significance criteria related to wetlands and Sections 4.5.3.4, 4.5.4.5, and 4.5.5.4 for an analysis of wetland impacts associated with construction. 9. The BIA has completed all public involvement in accordance with the requirements outlined in the Indian Affairs National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Guidebook (59 IAM 3-H).

13-Aug-16	Jo Ann Richmond	Yes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. She opposes the project and believes the BIA is incorrect in dismissing concerns as "not significant" and has the following concerns: 2. She states that there is not a revenue sharing agreement with St. Joseph County. 3. Traffic from the casino will be an issue. 4. The EIS dismisses problem gambling as "not significant." 5. The environmental mitigation will take place in the State of Michigan and not in the community. 6. The EIS dismisses a likely increase in bankruptcies. 7. The BIA dismisses the bankruptcy rates, violent crimes, autho thefts, and larceny increase that comes with the opening of a new casino. 8. The BIA is dismissing wetland impacts as "less than significant." 9. She asks that another hearing be held to address vital issues that have been dismissed. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment noted. 2. Comment noted. 3. Please see Sections 4.8.3.1, 4.8.4.1, and 4.8.5.1 for an analysis of traffic impacts and Section 5.8.1 for mitigation measures related to transportation. 4. Please see Section 4.7.1.5 for explanations of significance criteria related to the potential social costs associated with gambling, and Sections 4.7.3.5, 4.7.4.5, and 4.7.5.6 for an analysis of potential social costs. 5. Mitigation discussed in the FEIS takes place in the State of Indiana and in the community. Please see Sections 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5 for an explanation of the mitigation measures related to land resources, water resources, air quality, and biological resources, respectively. 6. Please see Sections 4.7.1.2 and 4.7.1.6 for explanation of significance criteria related to employment and income and fiscal effects to the County, and Sections 4.7.3.1, 4.7.3.6, 4.7.4.1, and 4.7.4.6 for an analysis of direct economic effects of the project and fiscal effects to the County. 7. Please see Section 4.7.1.5 for explanations of significance criteria related to the potential social costs associated with gambling, and Sections 4.7.3.5, 4.7.4.5, and 4.7.5.6 for an analysis of potential social costs. 8. Please see Section 4.5.1.4 for an explanation of significance criteria related to wetlands and Sections 4.5.3.4, 4.5.4.5, and 4.5.5.4 for an analysis of wetland impacts associated with construction. 9. The BIA has completed all public involvement in accordance with the requirements outlined in the Indian Affairs National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Guidebook (59 IAM 3-H).
14-Aug-16	Kevin Mitschelen	No	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. He opposes the project and believes the BIA is incorrect in dismissing concerns as "not significant" and has the following concerns: 2. He states that there is not a revenue sharing agreement with St. Joseph County. 3. Traffic from the casino will be an issue. 4. The EIS dismisses problem gambling as "not significant." 5. The environmental mitigation will take place in the State of Michigan and not in the community. 6. The EIS dismisses a likely increase in bankruptcies. 7. The BIA dismisses the bankruptcy rates, violent crimes, autho thefts, and larceny increase that comes with the opening of a new casino. 8. The BIA is dismissing wetland impacts as "less than significant." 9. He asks that another hearing be held to address vital issues that have been dismissed. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment noted. 2. Comment noted. 3. Please see Sections 4.8.3.1, 4.8.4.1, and 4.8.5.1 for an analysis of traffic impacts and Section 5.8.1 for mitigation measures related to transportation. 4. Please see Section 4.7.1.5 for explanations of significance criteria related to the potential social costs associated with gambling, and Sections 4.7.3.5, 4.7.4.5, and 4.7.5.6 for an analysis of potential social costs. 5. Mitigation discussed in the FEIS takes place in the State of Indiana and in the community. Please see Sections 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5 for an explanation of the mitigation measures related to land resources, water resources, air quality, and biological resources, respectively. 6. Please see Sections 4.7.1.2 and 4.7.1.6 for explanation of significance criteria related to employment and income and fiscal effects to the County, and Sections 4.7.3.1, 4.7.3.6, 4.7.4.1, and 4.7.4.6 for an analysis of direct economic effects of the project and fiscal effects to the County. 7. Please see Section 4.7.1.5 for explanations of significance criteria related to the potential social costs associated with gambling, and Sections 4.7.3.5, 4.7.4.5, and 4.7.5.6 for an analysis of potential social costs. 8. Please see Section 4.5.1.4 for an explanation of significance criteria related to wetlands and Sections 4.5.3.4, 4.5.4.5, and 4.5.5.4 for an analysis of wetland impacts associated with construction. 9. The BIA has completed all public involvement in accordance with the requirements outlined in the Indian Affairs National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Guidebook (59 IAM 3-H).
14-Aug-16	Sly Foltz	No	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. He opposes the project and believes the BIA is incorrect in dismissing concerns as "not significant" and has the following concerns: 2. He states that there is not a revenue sharing agreement with St. Joseph County. 3. Traffic from the casino will be an issue. 4. The EIS dismisses problem gambling as "not significant." 5. The environmental mitigation will take place in the State of Michigan and not in the community. 6. The EIS dismisses a likely increase in bankruptcies. 7. The BIA dismisses the bankruptcy rates, violent crimes, autho thefts, and larceny increase that comes with the opening of a new casino. 8. The BIA is dismissing wetland impacts as "less than significant." 9. He asks that another hearing be held to address vital issues that have been dismissed. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment noted. 2. Comment noted. 3. Please see Sections 4.8.3.1, 4.8.4.1, and 4.8.5.1 for an analysis of traffic impacts and Section 5.8.1 for mitigation measures related to transportation. 4. Please see Section 4.7.1.5 for explanations of significance criteria related to the potential social costs associated with gambling, and Sections 4.7.3.5, 4.7.4.5, and 4.7.5.6 for an analysis of potential social costs. 5. Mitigation discussed in the FEIS takes place in the State of Indiana and in the community. Please see Sections 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5 for an explanation of the mitigation measures related to land resources, water resources, air quality, and biological resources, respectively. 6. Please see Sections 4.7.1.2 and 4.7.1.6 for explanation of significance criteria related to employment and income and fiscal effects to the County, and Sections 4.7.3.1, 4.7.3.6, 4.7.4.1, and 4.7.4.6 for an analysis of direct economic effects of the project and fiscal effects to the County. 7. Please see Section 4.7.1.5 for explanations of significance criteria related to the potential social costs associated with gambling, and Sections 4.7.3.5, 4.7.4.5, and 4.7.5.6 for an analysis of potential social costs. 8. Please see Section 4.5.1.4 for an explanation of significance criteria related to wetlands and Sections 4.5.3.4, 4.5.4.5, and 4.5.5.4 for an analysis of wetland impacts associated with construction. 9. The BIA has completed all public involvement in accordance with the requirements outlined in the Indian Affairs National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Guidebook (59 IAM 3-H).

15-Aug-16	Maggie Judd	No	<p>1. She opposes the project and believes the BIA is incorrect in dismissing concerns as "not significant" and has the following concerns:</p> <p>2. She states that there is not a revenue sharing agreement with St. Joseph County.</p> <p>3. Traffic from the casino will be an issue.</p> <p>4. The EIS dismisses problem gambling as "not significant."</p> <p>5. The environmental mitigation will take place in the State of Michigan and not in the community.</p> <p>6. The EIS dismisses a likely increase in bankruptcies.</p> <p>7. The BIA dismisses the bankruptcy rates, violent crimes, auto thefts, and larceny increase that comes with the opening of a new casino.</p> <p>8. The BIA is dismissing wetland impacts as "less than significant."</p> <p>9. She asks that another hearing be held to address vital issues that have been dismissed.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted.</p> <p>2. Comment noted.</p> <p>3. Please see Sections 4.8.3.1, 4.8.4.1, and 4.8.5.1 for an analysis of traffic impacts and Section 5.8.1 for mitigation measures related to transportation.</p> <p>4. Please see Section 4.7.1.5 for explanations of significance criteria related to the potential social costs associated with gambling, and Sections 4.7.3.5, 4.7.4.5, and 4.7.5.6 for an analysis of potential social costs.</p> <p>5. Mitigation discussed in the FEIS takes place in the State of Indiana and in the community. Please see Sections 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5 for an explanation of the mitigation measures related to land resources, water resources, air quality, and biological resources, respectively.</p> <p>6. Please see Sections 4.7.1.2 and 4.7.1.6 for explanation of significance criteria related to employment and income and fiscal effects to the County, and Sections 4.7.3.1, 4.7.3.6, 4.7.4.1, and 4.7.4.6 for an analysis of direct economic effects of the project and fiscal effects to the County.</p> <p>7. Please see Section 4.7.1.5 for explanations of significance criteria related to the potential social costs associated with gambling, and Sections 4.7.3.5, 4.7.4.5, and 4.7.5.6 for an analysis of potential social costs.</p> <p>8. Please see Section 4.5.1.4 for an explanation of significance criteria related to wetlands and Sections 4.5.3.4, 4.5.4.5, and 4.5.5.4 for an analysis of wetland impacts associated with construction.</p> <p>9. The BIA has completed all public involvement in accordance with the requirements outlined in the Indian Affairs National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Guidebook (59 IAM 3-H).</p>
15-Aug-16	Carla Gunden	No	<p>1. She opposes the project and believes the BIA is incorrect in dismissing concerns as "not significant" and has the following concerns:</p> <p>2. She states that there is not a revenue sharing agreement with St. Joseph County.</p> <p>3. Traffic from the casino will be an issue.</p> <p>4. The EIS dismisses problem gambling as "not significant."</p> <p>5. The environmental mitigation will take place in the State of Michigan and not in the community.</p> <p>6. The EIS dismisses a likely increase in bankruptcies.</p> <p>7. The BIA dismisses the bankruptcy rates, violent crimes, auto thefts, and larceny increase that comes with the opening of a new casino.</p> <p>8. The BIA is dismissing wetland impacts as "less than significant."</p> <p>9. She asks that another hearing be held to address vital issues that have been dismissed.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted.</p> <p>2. Comment noted.</p> <p>3. Please see Sections 4.8.3.1, 4.8.4.1, and 4.8.5.1 for an analysis of traffic impacts and Section 5.8.1 for mitigation measures related to transportation.</p> <p>4. Please see Section 4.7.1.5 for explanations of significance criteria related to the potential social costs associated with gambling, and Sections 4.7.3.5, 4.7.4.5, and 4.7.5.6 for an analysis of potential social costs.</p> <p>5. Mitigation discussed in the FEIS takes place in the State of Indiana and in the community. Please see Sections 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5 for an explanation of the mitigation measures related to land resources, water resources, air quality, and biological resources, respectively.</p> <p>6. Please see Sections 4.7.1.2 and 4.7.1.6 for explanation of significance criteria related to employment and income and fiscal effects to the County, and Sections 4.7.3.1, 4.7.3.6, 4.7.4.1, and 4.7.4.6 for an analysis of direct economic effects of the project and fiscal effects to the County.</p> <p>7. Please see Section 4.7.1.5 for explanations of significance criteria related to the potential social costs associated with gambling, and Sections 4.7.3.5, 4.7.4.5, and 4.7.5.6 for an analysis of potential social costs.</p> <p>8. Please see Section 4.5.1.4 for an explanation of significance criteria related to wetlands and Sections 4.5.3.4, 4.5.4.5, and 4.5.5.4 for an analysis of wetland impacts associated with construction.</p> <p>9. The BIA has completed all public involvement in accordance with the requirements outlined in the Indian Affairs National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Guidebook (59 IAM 3-H).</p>
17-Aug-16	Aaron Miller	No	<p>1. He opposes the project and believes the BIA is incorrect in dismissing concerns as "not significant" and has the following concerns:</p> <p>2. He states that there is not a revenue sharing agreement with St. Joseph County.</p> <p>3. Traffic from the casino will be an issue.</p> <p>4. The EIS dismisses problem gambling as "not significant."</p> <p>5. The environmental mitigation will take place in the State of Michigan and not in the community.</p> <p>6. The EIS dismisses a likely increase in bankruptcies.</p> <p>7. The BIA dismisses the bankruptcy rates, violent crimes, auto thefts, and larceny increase that comes with the opening of a new casino.</p> <p>8. The BIA is dismissing wetland impacts as "less than significant."</p> <p>9. He asks that another hearing be held to address vital issues that have been dismissed.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted.</p> <p>2. Comment noted.</p> <p>3. Please see Sections 4.8.3.1, 4.8.4.1, and 4.8.5.1 for an analysis of traffic impacts and Section 5.8.1 for mitigation measures related to transportation.</p> <p>4. Please see Section 4.7.1.5 for explanations of significance criteria related to the potential social costs associated with gambling, and Sections 4.7.3.5, 4.7.4.5, and 4.7.5.6 for an analysis of potential social costs.</p> <p>5. Mitigation discussed in the FEIS takes place in the State of Indiana and in the community. Please see Sections 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5 for an explanation of the mitigation measures related to land resources, water resources, air quality, and biological resources, respectively.</p> <p>6. Please see Sections 4.7.1.2 and 4.7.1.6 for explanation of significance criteria related to employment and income and fiscal effects to the County, and Sections 4.7.3.1, 4.7.3.6, 4.7.4.1, and 4.7.4.6 for an analysis of direct economic effects of the project and fiscal effects to the County.</p> <p>7. Please see Section 4.7.1.5 for explanations of significance criteria related to the potential social costs associated with gambling, and Sections 4.7.3.5, 4.7.4.5, and 4.7.5.6 for an analysis of potential social costs.</p> <p>8. Please see Section 4.5.1.4 for an explanation of significance criteria related to wetlands and Sections 4.5.3.4, 4.5.4.5, and 4.5.5.4 for an analysis of wetland impacts associated with construction.</p> <p>9. The BIA has completed all public involvement in accordance with the requirements outlined in the Indian Affairs National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Guidebook (59 IAM 3-H).</p>

22-Aug-16	Joan and Bill Stroup	Yes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They opposes the project and believes the BIA is incorrect in dismissing concerns as "not significant" and has the following concerns: 2. They state that there is not a revenue sharing agreement with St. Joseph County. 3. Traffic from the casino will be an issue. 4. The EIS dismisses problem gambling as "not significant." 5. The environmental mitigation will take place in the State of Michigan and not in the community. 6. The EIS dismisses a likely increase in bankruptcies. 7. The BIA dismisses the bankruptcy rates, violent crimes, auto thefts, and larceny increase that comes with the opening of a new casino. 8. The BIA is dismissing wetland impacts as "less than significant." 9. They ask that another hearing be held to address vital issues that have been dismissed. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment noted. 2. Comment noted. 3. Please see Sections 4.8.3.1, 4.8.4.1, and 4.8.5.1 for an analysis of traffic impacts and Section 5.8.1 for mitigation measures related to transportation. 4. Please see Section 4.7.1.5 for explanations of significance criteria related to the potential social costs associated with gambling, and Sections 4.7.3.5, 4.7.4.5, and 4.7.5.6 for an analysis of potential social costs. 5. Mitigation discussed in the FEIS takes place in the State of Indiana and in the community. Please see Sections 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5 for an explanation of the mitigation measures related to land resources, water resources, air quality, and biological resources, respectively. 6. Please see Sections 4.7.1.2 and 4.7.1.6 for explanation of significance criteria related to employment and income and fiscal effects to the County, and Sections 4.7.3.1, 4.7.3.6, 4.7.4.1, and 4.7.4.6 for an analysis of direct economic effects of the project and fiscal effects to the County. 7. Please see Section 4.7.1.5 for explanations of significance criteria related to the potential social costs associated with gambling, and Sections 4.7.3.5, 4.7.4.5, and 4.7.5.6 for an analysis of potential social costs. 8. Please see Section 4.5.1.4 for an explanation of significance criteria related to wetlands and Sections 4.5.3.4, 4.5.4.5, and 4.5.5.4 for an analysis of wetland impacts associated with construction. 9. The BIA has completed all public involvement in accordance with the requirements outlined in the Indian Affairs National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Guidebook (59 IAM 3-H).
22-Aug-16	Valerie Smith	No	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. She opposes the project and believes the BIA is incorrect in dismissing concerns as "not significant" and has the following concerns: 2. She states that there is not a revenue sharing agreement with St. Joseph County. 3. Traffic from the casino will be an issue. 4. The EIS dismisses problem gambling as "not significant." 5. The environmental mitigation will take place in the State of Michigan and not in the community. 6. The EIS dismisses a likely increase in bankruptcies. 7. The BIA dismisses the bankruptcy rates, violent crimes, auto thefts, and larceny increase that comes with the opening of a new casino. 8. The BIA is dismissing wetland impacts as "less than significant." 9. She asks that another hearing be held to address vital issues that have been dismissed. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment noted. 2. Comment noted. 3. Please see Sections 4.8.3.1, 4.8.4.1, and 4.8.5.1 for an analysis of traffic impacts and Section 5.8.1 for mitigation measures related to transportation. 4. Please see Section 4.7.1.5 for explanations of significance criteria related to the potential social costs associated with gambling, and Sections 4.7.3.5, 4.7.4.5, and 4.7.5.6 for an analysis of potential social costs. 5. Mitigation discussed in the FEIS takes place in the State of Indiana and in the community. Please see Sections 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5 for an explanation of the mitigation measures related to land resources, water resources, air quality, and biological resources, respectively. 6. Please see Sections 4.7.1.2 and 4.7.1.6 for explanation of significance criteria related to employment and income and fiscal effects to the County, and Sections 4.7.3.1, 4.7.3.6, 4.7.4.1, and 4.7.4.6 for an analysis of direct economic effects of the project and fiscal effects to the County. 7. Please see Section 4.7.1.5 for explanations of significance criteria related to the potential social costs associated with gambling, and Sections 4.7.3.5, 4.7.4.5, and 4.7.5.6 for an analysis of potential social costs. 8. Please see Section 4.5.1.4 for an explanation of significance criteria related to wetlands and Sections 4.5.3.4, 4.5.4.5, and 4.5.5.4 for an analysis of wetland impacts associated with construction. 9. The BIA has completed all public involvement in accordance with the requirements outlined in the Indian Affairs National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Guidebook (59 IAM 3-H).

Agency Comments

Date	Originator	Summary of Comments	Response
22-Aug-16	EPA: Kenneth A Westlake	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The EPA thanks the BIA for addressing their previous concerns on the DEIS, including stormwater bioretention and use of clean diesel practices during construction and operation. 2. They urge BIA to commit to utilizing specific green features for the project, such as renewable energy sources and composting, and to note those commitments in the ROD. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comments have been noted. 2. Green building decisions and renewable energy options will be reviewed for the final alternative during the design process.