COMMENTS
T3 – Goodsprings Hearing
Page 1 of 9

RESPONSES

ORIGINAL

Department of the Interior

Bureau of Land Management

Ivanpah Energy Center

Formal Public Comments

Taken at 375 West San Pedro Avenue

Goodsprings, Nevada

Thursday, December 12, 2002

7:00 P.M.

REPORTED BY: Jennifer O'Neill, CCR #763
LS&T Job No. 24690

litig@tion SERVICES & TECHNOLOGIES COURT REPORTING • CASE MANAGEMENT • DEPOSITORIES HTR

COMMENTS
T3 – Goodsprings Hearing
Page 2 of 9

PUBLIC HEARING - 12/12/02

T3.1

MR. GADD: I just want to start --

MR. CROCKFORD: Could you state your name.

MR. GADD: Gadd, G-a-d-d. I'm a resident of Goodsprings. And I want to tell you people that I'm a chronic asthmatic, I've been one all my life and my problem is breathing. A lot of people's problems are something else but I'm an expert on breathing. I couldn't breathe good enough in Los Angeles so I retired out here to my family's house about maybe 10, 13 years ago. I get along okay out here, it's a lot better because I can smell a cigarette a mile away, the smoke off one.

But anyway I wanted to ask Liz Warren didn't the Goodsprings Advisory Counsel turn down this power plant originally on the vote the first time?

MS. WARREN: We don't have the option of turning it down.

MR. GADD: I mean, you voted it down.

MS. WARREN: We wrote a lengthy response and some of those issues have been addressed in this draft statement.

MR. GADD: I thought that was true.

T3.2

MS. WARREN: And it was based on several issues. The most important one or one of the most important ones was the traffic situation on Goodsprings

LITIGATION SERVICES & TECHNOLOGIES

RESPONSES

T3.1 The DEIS states that temporary impacts to air quality would occur during construction from increased dust created from land clearing, site preparation, and vehicle movement. Dust control during construction activities will be in compliance with Clark County's dust control regulations. During plant operations, impacts to air quality would not be significant. The Ivanpah Energy Center is designed to be at, or below, national and local air quality standards. Additionally, modeling was performed to include emissions associated with operations of the proposed Ivanpah Airport and the Reliant Bighorn Facility. Modeling results indicate that the project's contribution to cumulative air emissions would have a negligible impact.

T3.2 The DEIS identifies that impacts to traffic and traffic safety will occur during construction of the plant facility. Mitigation measures to minimize impacts will be implemented. See response to Comment T1.1 above.

COMMENTS
T3 – Goodsprings Hearing
Page 3 of 9

PUBLIC HEARING - 12/12/02

T3.2 Cont'd.

Road, given the volume of traffic and given the kind of road that is, and also given the fact that Nevada Department of Transportation has no plans to expand that road, not to widen it, not to build regular shoulders on it, none of that. So that was a very important issue.

T3.3

Air quality was a big important issue, and water consumption, water use. In fact, basically we said move it around the corner, get it out of this valley because it will not be good for the people who live in Goodsprings and who are stationary basically as you are here and who will be subjected to this. And so we wanted it moved so that it would remove the stacks and whatever is going to be emitted from those stacks from our immediate vicinity.

T3.4

MR. GADD: Liz speaks for all of the Goodspringers, I'm sure.

Now, I've been down to Primm and I suppose everybody else here has and they should go down there and take a look at that plant and see how big it is. Now, that's all private property down there and they can do whatever they want. I know they want the power and I'm not against the power. I think we're going to have to have more of it but my concern is this: Besides the health and safety of the invalids up here,

T3.5

LITIGATION SERVICES & TECHNOLOGIES

RESPONSES

T3.3 Your comment regarding air quality impacts is acknowledged. See the response to Comment T3.1 above. As stated in the DEIS, Ivanpah Energy Center would use refrigerated air technology which drastically reduces the need for water, when compared to other power plants of similar size. The facility would use approximately 50 acre-feet per year (afy), of which 35 afy would be provided as gray water from the Southern Nevada Correctional Center; the remaining 15 afy would originate from a yet undetermined groundwater source.

T3.4 During public scoping, Goodsprings residents suggested a potential plant site west of I-15 between mileposts 5 and 7. The DEIS evaluated the potential site along with five other site locations within the Ivanpah Valley. The site suggested by the Goodsprings residents; however, was eliminated from further consideration because it is located within the Desert Tortoise Translocation Area, several miles of transmission line corridor outside of a BLM-designated utility corridor would be needed, and no reasonable alternative routes for construction were available. A potential alternative site in Primm was identified by the project proponent and if constructed, would be co-located with the Reliant Bighorn Power Plant. The Primm plant site and the proponent's proposed site at Goodsprings were carried forward for further evaluation in the DEIS.

As stated above in previous comments, BLM has selected the Primm Plant Site as the "agency-preferred alternative;" however, the Primm Plant site alternative became commercially unavailable following the closing of the public comment period. Therefore, the proposed plant site at Goodsprings and the No Action Alternative remain under consideration. BLM will select an "environmentally-preferred" alternative in the Record of

COMMENTS
T3 – Goodsprings Hearing
Page 4 of 9

PUBLIC HEARING - 12/12/02

T3.5 Cont'd.

the school children who we don't want any more asthmatics, and we should have the commissioner, the county commissioner, come up here and see our schools, which is a historic Clark County monument, talk to the teachers, talk to our citizens, visit our homes, we're proud of them, we put them up a rail at a time, and get familiar with the area because when they -- if they put a plant of that size on our front porch, which is the only way you can get up here is by coming right by it, nobody in their right mind would spend a nickle for this property and nobody is going to get any value out of their real estate because why would we, they'll go to Vegas and build and buy. They're not going to come into a heavy industrial deal like Pittsburg was in the steel age, see.

T3.6

All I'm saying is please, please, move the plant further south or hide it some place behind some of these hills or something. Do something to keep the thing from just being an absolute monstrosity in this little-bity hamlet.

And we have a history here, there's a lot of people that live here and a lot of nice homes. We have a very distinguished citizen who's building a mansion here. Do you think he would want to drive back and forth and look at that thing every day of his life,

LITIGATION SERVICES & TECHNOLOGIES

RESPONSES

Also, see response to comment T3.1 above regarding air quality impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Ivanpah Energy Center at the Goodsprings site.

T3.5 Potential impacts to real estate values cannot be determined due to the volatility of the market.

T3.6 BLM has selected the Primm Plant Site as the "agency-preferred alternative." However, following the close of the public comment period, the Primm Plant site alternative became commercially unavailable; therefore, the proposed plant site at Goodsprings and the No Action Alternative remain under consideration. BLM will select an "environmentally-preferred" alternative in the Record of Decision.

COMMENTS T3 – Goodsprings Hearing Page 5 of 9	RESPONSES
T3.7	**T3.7** See the above responses to comments T3.4 and T3.6.
T3.8 T3.9	**T3.8** As stated above, BLM has selected the Primm Plant Site as the "agency-preferred alternative." However, following the close of the public comment period, the Primm Plant site alternative became commercially unavailable; therefore, the proposed plant site at Goodsprings and the No Action Alternative remain under consideration. BLM will select an "environmentally-preferred" alternative in the Record of Decision.

COMMENTS T3 – Goodsprings Hearing Page 6 of 9	RESPONSES
T3.9 Cont'd.	**T3.9** Comment acknowledged.
T3.10	**T3.10** The commenter is correct. The DEIS states that motorists would encounter visual impacts at various points along I-15, SR 161, and the intersection of Sandy Valley Road and SR 161 (see discussion on page 5-74 of the DEIS); however, the impact would be negligible because the views would be brief and of short-duration. Of the four transmission line plant access options, Option 1, which would cross over the mountain to interconnect with the VEA line, would create a "moderate" impact (refer to pages 5-78 and 5-79 of the DEIS). The DEIS states that use of Option 2 or Option 3 would reduce visual impacts associated with Option 1. BLM will consider your comment regarding visual impacts associated with transmission line plant access Option 1.

COMMENTS
T3 – Goodsprings Hearing
Page 7 of 9

PUBLIC HEARING - 12/12/02

T3.10 Cont'd.

T3.11

T3.12

there's no way that scar will ever be, and not in my lifetime nor anybody's great-grandchild in this room, would ever be obscured. So I think that that would be something I think when we look at it again as a board, we'll probably discuss that at the meeting.

Speaking as the town board chair, we had requested that the whole project be moved out of the Goodsprings Valley and so we would support that option that you have here; that is the Primm site, the alternative that you have identified. Most of what we have every day is a fairly open valley. Yes, there's now a lot of vehicular traffic, not nearly like what you get in town, but still a lot for this area. Any siting of this kind of plant will cause major damage to the air quality, the noise emissions, and all that kind of thing will impact it.

And while it may not seem like a lot for any one plant, by the time you accumulate these effects you're going to have a substantial change in this valley and we would like to see that deflected and put down along the I-15 corridor, which is already in my opinion condemned, to have all of those kinds of activities. It won't be noticed down there nearly the way it would be up here in this valley.

We'll have an opportunity, we won't have an

LITIGATION SERVICES & TECHNOLOGIES

RESPONSES

T3.11 As stated above, BLM has selected the Primm Plant Site as the "agency-preferred alternative." However, following the close of the public comment period, the Primm Plant site alternative became commercially unavailable; therefore, the proposed plant site at Goodsprings and the No Action Alternative remain under consideration. BLM will select an "environmentally-preferred" alternative in the Record of Decision.

T3.12 The DEIS acknowledges that the Ivanpah Valley is likely to undergo major changes as a result of future development. As indicated in DEIS Section 6.2 (Cumulative Impacts), projects such as the proposed Ivanpah Valley Airport, the Las Vegas Valley Water District pipeline, and the Table Mountain Wind Farm are expected to contribute to air quality degradation, additional loss of habitat, and degradation of visual and aesthetics resources within the area. Some impacts will be short-term and largely related to construction, others will persist throughout the life of the project. Additional impacts will result from induced development that would be associated with major projects. We acknowledge the commentor's preference for the Ivanpah Energy Center to be located at the Primm Plant Site.

COMMENTS
T3 – Goodsprings Hearing
Page 8 of 9

RESPONSES

PUBLIC HEARING - 12/11/02

it wouldn't have that type of effect.

Actually, the Primm site, there is no visual impacts going to be felt, because you have already got buildings down there and another site similar; so expanding that, people would expect to see it.

MS. BENNER: I'm in agreement. I think it should go in Primm.

MR. CROCKFORD: Any more comments? If not, we are going to shut down our comment period, official hearing of the comments and remind you that formal hearing type is closed now, and keep in mind that the comment period is open until January 21st.

If you have the dates up through -- the 20th is a holiday; so it is going to be January 21st, 22nd.

The Environmental Protection Agency is published on November 22, 2002. When they put it in there, they said the comment period closes on January -- it was incorrect -- the first part of January; so we talked to them, wrote them a letter, and they are going to -- they already had put in a correction and it coincides with ours. They had given something like 40 days. It was not correct so we brought their attention to that; so you have a 60-day comment period, and it started the 22nd; so you have 60 days, and then we will pull comments back together, and we will come back out.

LITIGATION SERVICES & TECHNOLOGIES

COMMENTS
T3 – Goodsprings Hearing
Page 9 of 9

RESPONSES

PUBLIC HEARING - 12/12/02

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF NEVADA)
) ss:
COUNTY OF CLARK)

I, Jennifer O'Neill, Certified Shorthand Reporter, hereby certify that I took down in Stenotype all of the proceedings had in the before-entitled matter at the time and place indicated, and that thereafter said Stenotype notes were transcribed into typewriting at and under my supervision.

That the foregoing transcript constitutes a full, true and accurate record of the proceedings had.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I hereunto subscribe my name at Las Vegas, Nevada.

JENNIFER O'NEILL, CCR #763

LITIGATION SERVICES & TECHNOLOGIES