

Page 3 EN3-ITEP summary of emissions by reservation

Were any other pollutants quantified? If so, it would be beneficial to add those pollutants to the emissions summary.

Page 3, Last Paragraph, Last Sentence

It would be beneficial to add the source of the Montana data (e.g., 2014 NEI, Montana DEQ) to the last sentence as the data called upon to warrant a review were compiled not generated by Ramboll for the WRAP.

Page 4 Ramboll (for WRAP) summary of emissions by reservation

I believe that other pollutants were quantified beyond PM and VOCs. It would be beneficial to add those pollutants to the emissions summary.

On page 3, Navajo Nation, is the single SJ County source (oil tanks), SJ County, UT? I am assuming it is since the majority of oil production on the nation is in the Aneth field.

On the bottom of page 4 you making reference to NM and CO trust lands, is this in reference only to lands held in trust by the federal government or does it include State or Fee Lands located within the reservation boundary?

Montana tribal emissions: I checked tribal emissions in the most recent baseline emission inventory spreadsheet and the June 10th version reviewed by EN3. For the MT counties of Dawson, Custer, Prairie, Fallon and Wibaux, tribal emission totals are zero. There are rows in the database for tribal emissions, but those rows do not include any emissions.

The 8761 tpy VOC estimate is for all wellsite source oil tanks in San Juan county, not a single source.

Fort Berthold: Important to consider that discrepancy between the EN3 and Ramboll inventory may be driven by 1) differing point/nonpoint criteria and 2) emission estimation methodology differences for wellsite sources estimates from permits in the EN3 inventory and from nonpoint survey data in the Ramboll inventory.