SECTION 2
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) published a Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Ivanpah Energy Center project on February 15, 2002 in the *Federal Register*. Public scoping meetings were held on March 5, 6, and 7, 2002 to identify the action, alternatives, and impacts to be addressed in the EIS. The meetings included a presentation describing the proposed project (Goodsprings Plant Site), an explanation of the NEPA process, followed by an opportunity for attendees to ask questions. Comments received during the scoping process identified issues of concern and provided the basis for analyses in preparation of the Draft EIS.

Prior to completion of the Draft EIS, Western Area Power Administration (Western) requested participation as a cooperating agency in BLM's Ivanpah Energy Center EIS effort. The BLM and Western issued a Notice of Availability (NOA) for publication in the *Federal Register* on November 22, 2002, releasing the Draft EIS for a 60-day public review. Under the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) NEPA regulations, after preparation of the Draft EIS and prior to preparation of the Final EIS, agencies are required to obtain comments from federal agencies and request comments from the appropriate state and local agencies, Native Americans, other agencies in receipt of the environmental impact statement, the project applicant, and members of the public (40 CFR 1503.1).

During the public comment period, BLM and Western held three official public hearings to receive written and oral comments on the adequacy of the Draft EIS and the Ivanpah Energy Center project. The public hearings were held December 10, 11, and 12, 2002 in Las Vegas, Sandy Valley, and Goodsprings, Nevada, respectively. Oral comments were formally received through transcription by a certified court reporter. Comment forms were made available for the public to complete and submit to BLM. The public comment period ended on January 21, 2003.

Written comments were received by the BLM via email and mail. BLM received nine written comments from federal and state agencies, a municipality, and interested organizations. Numerous oral comments were received by transcription from participants at the three formal public hearings. The applicant submitted comments on the Draft EIS via email. BLM did not receive written comments from individuals.

All written comments as well as the oral transcripts received during the public comment period were assigned an alphanumeric identification number, consisting of a letter to denote where the comment originated and a number for each individual document as shown in the following table.

Document Identification #	**Commentor**
Federal Agencies	
F1	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
F2	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
State Agencies	
S1	Nevada Historic Preservation
S2	Nevada Division of Water Resources
S3	Nevada Environmental Protection Agency
S4	Nevada Division of Wildlife
Municipality	
M1	City of Henderson
Organizations	
O1	Red Rock Audubon Society
O2	Kern River Gas Transmission Company
O3	Southern Nevada Water Authority/Las Vegas Valley Water District
Transcripts	
T1	Las Vegas Public Hearing
T2	Sandy Valley Public Hearing
T3	Goodsprings Public Hearing
Project Proponent	
P1	Ivanpah Energy Center, LP, a Diamond Generating Corporation Company

Each document was reviewed and individual comments were identified within each document. The individual comments were then assigned an additional number as a subset of the numbered document. For example, comment S4.5 is the fourth state agency submittal (Nevada Division of Wildlife) and the fifth comment within the document.

The primary issues addressed in the comments submitted to BLM are summarized in the following list:

- Plant siting and preference to the alternative plant site
- Impacts to air quality

- Impacts to water resources
- Plant and wildlife impacts
- Traffic-related impacts associated with the proposed plant site
- Visual impacts related to the proposed plant site

Under CEQ regulations (40 CFR 1503.4), agencies are required to consider comments both individually and collectively and state their response in the Final EIS by one of the following means:

1. Modify alternatives including the proposed action.
2. Develop and evaluate new alternatives.
3. Supplement, improve, or modify its analyses.
4. Make factual correction.
5. Explain why the comments do not warrant further agency response.

BLM and Western have completed their review of comments on the Ivanpah Energy Center Draft EIS. All comments received a response. Some comments did not specifically address the adequacy of the DEIS or require a response as described above, but responses were provided for clarity. Responses to the comments are provided in the following pages as part of the Final EIS.