

Attachment G

Responses to Comments on the Final EIS

Table G1. Responses to Comments on the Final EIS

Comment No.	Letter No.	Comment	Response
1	1	<p>The BLM should require as conditions of the ROW approval for the SSEP the following: Requirements for implementation of all the Applicant Committed Environmental Protection Measures (ACEPM) in Table 2.2 and Management Stipulations and Best Management Practices in Table 2.1 in the FEIS;</p> <p>Particularly valuable Applicant Committed mitigation measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% surveys for burrowing owls and relocation of any owls found; • 100% clearance surveys for desert tortoise, kit fox and badgers, as well as the requirement that NextEra adhere to all funding requirements and stipulations of a memorandum of understanding (MOU) (once approved) regarding wildlife clearances and studies; • Construction emissions BMPs would be used to assure that construction of the project results in PM₁₀ less than 70 tons per year (tpy), which is the threshold for minor sources in the nonattainment area. The final construction schedule and construction management would reflect this commitment; 	<p>As described in Section 7 of the ROD (Environmental Protection Measures; Best Management Practices; And Laws, Ordinances, Regulations And Standards Applicable to the Selected Alternative), all requirements mentioned are conditions of approval of the ROD.</p>
2	1	<p>The BLM should require as conditions of the ROW approval for the SSEP the following: Requirements for implementation of key potential mitigation measures listed in the FEIS at 4-261, including signage and speed bumps on the SSEP access road; protecting migratory bird resources by complying with the MBTA and having a qualified biologist conduct nest clearance surveys prior to all vegetation clearing; minimizing the potential for avian collisions with and electrocutions from power lines by designing and constructing all power lines to comply with the Avian Protection Plan Guidelines (APLIC and USFWS 2005) and the Suggested Practices for Avian Protection on Power Lines: The State of the Art in 2006 (APLIC 2006); and minimizing the risk of wildlife mortality from vehicle collisions by periodically collecting trash from project access roads;</p>	<p>As described in Section 8 of the ROD (Mitigation Measures), the mitigation measures considered in the final EIS, with the exceptions in Table 1 of the ROD, have been adopted in the decision as conditions of approval.</p>
3	1	<p>The BLM should require as conditions of the ROW approval for the SSEP the following: Requirements for monitoring to measure residual impacts;</p>	<p>Section 9 of the ROD (Monitoring and Enforcement) describes the requirements that mitigation be successfully implemented and describes the plan that will be used to ensure compliance. The referenced (and attached to the ROD) Environmental and Construction Compliance Monitoring Plan also addresses the identification of specific success criteria in Section 3.2 (Monitoring Schedule, Success Criteria, and Adaptive Management). Residual impacts may be monitored where appropriate for determining compliance or adapting mitigation approaches.</p>
4	1	<p>The BLM should require as conditions of the ROW approval for the SSEP the following: Detailed requirements for additional mitigation measures including construction of wildlife fencing and wildlife crossing structures along the access road should acceptable, science-based thresholds for wildlife impacts be exceeded.</p>	<p>Section 9 of the ROD (Monitoring and Enforcement) describes the requirements that mitigation be successfully implemented and describes the plan that will be used to ensure</p>

Table G1. Responses to Comments on the Final EIS

Comment No.	Letter No.	Comment	Response
			compliance. The referenced (and attached) Environmental and Construction Compliance Monitoring Plan also addresses the identification of specific success criteria in Section 3.2 (Monitoring Schedule, Success Criteria, and Adaptive Management). These will be subject to an adaptive management approach, which may incorporate appropriate science-based thresholds as they become available.
5	1	The BLM should include as conditions of the ROW approval a requirement that NextEra fund the proposed Wildlife Survey and Wildlife Community studies developed by the AGFD. The studies should be funded and completed if any of the SSEP is constructed, not dependent on completion of all three phases of the SSEP.	BLM has included the MOU stipulating funding of these studies, as agreed to by AZGFD and Boulevard, as part of this decision. However, because BLM was not a party to the MOU and the funded studies do not mitigate identified impacts of the approved action, BLM will not stipulate funding or completion details contrary to the MOU.
6	1	As part of the Lower Sonoran/SDNM RMP process, we support the designation of Wildlife Habitat Areas and Movement Corridors in the planning area and designation of these areas as avoidance areas. We also encourage the BLM to strengthen the management actions associated with these designations in the final RMP. The BLM should also perform a route density analysis to determine the most appropriate density for the protection of wildlife in the WHAs and WMCs.	We have forwarded your comment to the BLM team in charge of the RMP revision process.
7	1	The BLM should monitor compliance with and enforce the agency's guidance on due diligence for solar energy ROW applications, including the technical and financial capability of solar energy ROW applicants to construct, operate and maintain their projects for the duration of the ROW term. The BLM should also require NextEra to have possession of a PPA as a condition of issuing a Notice to Proceed for the SSEP.	Per its internal guidance, BLM continues to monitor and enforce due diligence actions. As noted in Section 4 of the ROD (Decisions), "As a special stipulation of this decision, BLM will not issue any NTP until a power purchase agreement of sufficient size to warrant construction of at least the first phase of the Selected Alternative (including the gen-tie line) has been secured by Boulevard."
8	1	The BLM should clarify in the ROD how much water will be required for washing PV panels under Sub-alternative A-1 to clear up the inconsistency on page 2-70 of the FEIS.	The statements on page 2-70 are not contradictory. A single day of panel washing would require approximately 45,000 gallons of water. Because panel washing would not take place every day, average annual total use would be closer to 10.5 million gpy, or an average of 28,767 gpd.
9	1	In addition to these Potential mitigation Measures, we suggest adding some specific mitigation requirements including that soil disturbance should be minimized, wherever possible, recognizing that a development such as this will disturb a lot of soil. Trucks and all construction equipment should follow existing roadways whenever possible and any new roads should be limited. Any reseeding or replanting should be done with native endemic species. Every effort to minimize	Thank you for your suggestions. Several mitigation measures to minimize soil disturbance have already been included in the final EIS and ROD. In addition, two project alternatives were designed to reduce soil disturbance, including the selected

Table G1. Responses to Comments on the Final EIS

Comment No.	Letter No.	Comment	Response
		introduction and spread of non-native species should be employed, including ensuring that reseeded mixtures are not polluted with non-native seed, washing down tires on construction vehicles that have driven through areas with non-native invasive species, and spot removal of any invasive plants in and on the perimeter of the site, including manual removal whenever possible. The use of herbicides should be minimized. Invasive plants can proliferate along roadways, so periodic assessment and removal of invasive species along roads should also be performed.	alternative. Similarly, mitigation measures were already considered related to the use of native species, minimizing invasive species introduction, treatment of noxious weeds, and minimizing the use of herbicides. These mitigation measures have all been carried forward as conditions of approval. As such, no new measures have been incorporated within the ROD.
10	1	Beyond the benefits of the reduced footprint, the BLM should ensure that the artificial lighting for the SSEP is planned and implemented according to the current best practices recommended for preserving dark skies resources.	As described in Section 7 of the ROD (Environmental Protection Measures; Best Management Practices; And Laws, Ordinances, Regulations And Standards Applicable to the Selected Alternative), all applicant committed environmental protection measures (ACEPMs) are conditions of approval of the ROD. These include a commitment to using the minimum illumination needed for safety and security, and shielding and orienting lights to minimize impacts. In addition, a lighting plan will be prepared as part of the plan of development, and will require BLM approval.
11	1	As described in the FEIS, the BLM should implement the requirement for a performance and reclamation bond as a condition of authorization issuance for the SSEP.	As described in Section 4 of the ROD (Decisions), a performance and authorization bond will be required.
12	1	We recommend that the BLM and the applicant work with the local non-profit Wild at Heart for any relocation of burrowing owls.	Wild at Heart is the anticipated contractor for relocation of any burrowing owls, subject to USFWS approval.
1	2	We recommend that mitigation measures described in the FEIS for the preferred alternative be fully adopted in the Record of Decision (ROD).	As described in Section 8 of the ROD (Mitigation Measures), all practicable mitigation measures from the final EIS have been adopted. The mitigation measures not adopted, and the rationale for not adopting them, are described in Section 8.1.
2	2	We further suggest the ROD establish specific success criteria, where appropriate.	Section 9 of the ROD (Monitoring and Enforcement) describes the requirements that mitigation be successfully implemented and references the attached plan that will be used to ensure compliance. The Environmental and Construction Compliance Monitoring Plan also addresses the identification of specific success criteria in Section 3.2 (Monitoring Schedule,

Table G1. Responses to Comments on the Final EIS

Comment No.	Letter No.	Comment	Response
			Success Criteria, and Adaptive Management).
3	2	The FEIS acknowledges the uncertain long-term effectiveness of hazing to discourage birds from the one-acre pond, containing the reverse osmosis reject stream. Therefore, we recommend that failure to meet the success criteria, as defined for this mitigation measure within the ROD, trigger the submission of revised mitigation measures. If success criteria cannot be met with revised hazing mitigation measures, the ROD should require the project proponent to consider alternative methods to dispose of the reverse osmosis reject stream.	Section 3.2 of the ROD's Environmental and Construction Compliance Monitoring Plan states that "BLM will use adaptive management to gauge the level of monitoring required, as well as to modify mitigation measures, etc. if compliance with a condition of approval is not successful." In addition, the plan's Table E1 of mitigation measures includes the following compliance action related to the mitigation measure described: "Monitor wildlife access to ponds. Escalate access prevention methods, to include alternate water disposal methods, if hazing is unsuccessful."
4	2	Another impact that can be minimized through the incorporation of success criteria is the impact on downstream drainages from the storm water management system. We recommend the ROD require periodic inspection of downstream drainages for comparison with pre-development conditions documented prior to project construction. This periodic inspection by an appropriate professional (e.g. geologist or hydrologist) could lead to operational changes to the storm water management system if drainages are eroded by excessive quantities of water or appear to no longer receive water	At your suggestion, Section 12 of the ROD (Errata) and Table E1 of the Environmental and Construction Compliance Monitoring Plan include the following mitigation measure: "To reduce the risk of unforeseen hydrologic impacts, a qualified geologist or hydrologist will periodically inspect downstream drainages for comparison with pre-development conditions (which will be documented prior to project construction). Operational changes to the storm water management system will be taken to better match pre-development hydrology if drainages are eroded by excessive quantities of water or appear to no longer receive water."
5	2	Finally, EPA is also concerned about the potential impact of herbicides (pre-emergents) in the project area, as quantities are much higher than expected. The DEIS did not provide estimates for anticipated herbicide use; however, the FEIS states the proposed alternative would use more than 37,000 pounds of pre-emergent annually, and even the reduced footprint of the photovoltaic alternative would use more than 20,000 pounds annually (Table 2.16). We recommend BLM use the ROD to encourage alternative management practices that limit herbicide use to a last resort, focusing instead on other methods to limit vegetation and decrease fire risk. Possible alternatives include mowing and weed control fabric, which may need a layer of soil to prevent degradation due to ultra violet light.	At your suggestion, Section 12 of the ROD (Errata) and Table E1 of the Environmental and Construction Compliance Monitoring Plan include the following mitigation measure: "In order to reduce the level of herbicide use and disturbance of vegetation, an adaptive management approach to vegetation treatment and removal will be developed and implemented. Prior to the notice to proceed for any phase of work, the holder will work with BLM to determine how vegetation disturbance/removal and herbicide use may be practicably reduced in the upcoming project phase. In addition, the vegetation management plan will be reviewed annually to

Table G1. Responses to Comments on the Final EIS

Comment No.	Letter No.	Comment	Response
			incorporate new BMPs that meet these same goals. Alternative methods for vegetation management may include the use of mulching, weed barriers, mowing, and selective removal/treatment of undesirable species.”
1	3	Please approve PV technology as the BLM's preferred alternative. The solar footprint should be as small as possible. Once these lands are gone - or irrevocably changed - they are lost to us permanently.	The BLM has decided to approve Sub-alternative A1: Photovoltaic. The main project footprint (not including linear features) under the approved action will occupy approximately 1,907 acres, or 56% of the footprint under the Proposed Action.
1	4	Section 3.17	Page 3-103 Reference to Johnson 2011: Discussion pertains to visual analysis area which was defined in consultation with BLM, not technical reports. Suggest noting at the beginning that a technical report was developed for the project and remove all references.
2	4	Section 3.17.1	3-104 “Under the inventory process, the BLM applies three ranks...” change “ranks” to “ratings”
3	4	Section 3.17.1.2	3-105 Change all references from IOPs to KOPs. The proper term, in this use, is KOP.
4	4	Section 3.17.1.2	3-105 Change “...three sensitive viewing locations...” to “...three sensitive viewing location types...”
5	4	Section 4.17	4-190 Change scenic to visual management objectives
6	4	Section 4.17	4-190 Identified KOPs “...are selected from roads, trails...where large numbers of people might be able to view the project for an extended length of time.” Suggest changing to “where the casual observer might be able to view the project for an extended length of time.”
			The suggested change was not made because one of the considerations when choosing a KOP is traffic volume. The most obvious KOPs are on well-traveled routes. For this reason stating “where large numbers of people might be able to view the project for an extended length of time” is

Table G1. Responses to Comments on the Final EIS

Comment No.	Letter No.	Comment	Response	
			appropriate.	
7	4	Section 4.17 4-190	Add "Project-specific" before distance zones in the last sentence.	This change has been noted in Section 12 of the ROD (Errata).
8	4	Section 4.17 4-190	Similar to comment 6, the last paragraph notes that "KOPs are critical viewpoints of typical landscapes in the Project Area that a) were selected to represent the views of disturbances throughout the life of the project and that b) would be encountered by the greatest number of people." Suggest changing b to read "would be encountered by casual observers."	The suggested change was not made because one of the considerations when choosing a KOP is traffic volume. The most obvious KOPs are on well-traveled routes. For this reason stating "would be encountered by the greatest number of people" is appropriate.
9	4	Table 4.94 4-192	This table is confusing to the reader. The text notes that Buckeye Hills Regional Park would not have views of the project due to screening by topography. Suggest adding another column to clarify whether or not the project is visible.	Table 4.94 indicates that the SSEP will be visible in varying degrees from all the special designation areas as noted by the percent visible (written in parenthesis) in the table so an additional column is not necessary. However, Section 12 of the ROD (Errata) notes that the statement "The SSEP would be completely screened by topography and vegetation from the entire park" has been struck-out and replaced with "The SSEP would be visible from approximately 43% to 45% of the park depending on the alternative".
10	4	Section 4.17.2.3 4-195	The statement that photographic simulations were prepared for ALL KOPs is incorrect. Only some KOPs were selected for simulations, as stated in the technical report.	This change has been noted in Section 12 of the ROD (Errata).
11	4		Global comment throughout Chapter 4 – Contrast levels range from weak to moderate to strong. The use of these terms is inconsistent (sometimes low or high instead of weak or strong).	This change has been noted in Section 12 of the ROD (Errata).
12	4	Section 4.17.2.3.2 4-197	Contrast would be weak/moderate, not strong, from Quartz Peak, as noted in the contrast rating worksheet and technical report.	This change has been noted in Section 12 of the ROD (Errata).
13	4	Table 4.99 4-199	KOP 2, 6, 19: Sonoran Desert National Monument not Sonoran Desert Wilderness	This change has been noted in Section 12 of the ROD (Errata).
14	4	Section 4-204	Overall, the project would have strong visual contrast for all	This change has been noted in Section 12 of the

Table G1. Responses to Comments on the Final EIS

Comment No.	Letter No.	Comment	Response	
		4.17.4.1	alternatives. Depending on the viewer or KOP the level of contrast may vary based on viewing conditions, screening, distance, etc. This statement seems to be describing the results of the contrast rating analysis, not the overall project contrast. "Contrast levels would change from predominantly moderate (with strong contrasts at a few locations) under the Proposed Action to predominately weak (with moderate contrasts at a few locations) under Sub-Alternative A1."	ROD (Errata).
15	4	Section 4.17.4.1	4-204 The term "concentrated light" is used in reference to SSEP. This term was not used in the technical report or the project description, and is likely more applicable to Concentrating Solar Power (CSP) technology.	This change has been noted in Section 12 of the ROD (Errata).
16	4	Section 2.4	2-10 No Action Alternative. The last sentence states ". . . these wells would be filled, capped, and abandoned, and any associated site disturbance would be reclaimed." This is true for the three partially-constructed wells (borings temporarily filled with pea gravel), but shouldn't apply to the completed production well. The well represents a substantial capital investment, and even if NextEra were to walk away from the project, BLM may find this well useful in some capacity.	At this time, the BLM still intends for the facility to be fully reclaimed upon termination. To allow for the flexibility to retain wells as suggested, we have added the clause "unless otherwise directed by the BLM" to this sentence, as noted in Section 12 of the ROD (Errata).
17	4	Section 3.18.2.2.3	3-115 Well Spacing and Well Impact. The last sentence reads: "The SSEP GIU permit application is pending, and is currently under review by ADWR." It should read: "The SSEP GIU permit application has been approved by ADWR."	This change has been noted in Section 12 of the ROD (Errata).
18	4	Section 3.18.2.4.1	3-119 Gravity Survey. Beginning in this section, and throughout the rest of Section 3.18.2, there are five reference citations of "Carr 2010". This refers to the Groundwater Resource Evaluation technical report and should actually be "Golder 2010".	This change has been noted in Section 12 of the ROD (Errata).
19	4	Section 4.18.2.1	4-230 Analysis Area and Analysis Assumptions. Beginning in this section and throughout the rest of Section 4.18.2, there are 12 reference citations of "Carr 2010" that should be changed to "Golder 2010", as noted above. The reference to "Golder 2009" on page 4-231 should be "Golder 2010".	This change has been noted in Section 12 of the ROD (Errata).
20	4	Section	4-232 Proposed Action. The three references to "Golder 2009b" should	This change has been noted in Section 12 of the

Table G1. Responses to Comments on the Final EIS

Comment No.	Letter No.	Comment	Response	
		4.18.2.3	be "Golder 2010".	ROD (Errata).
21	4	Section 4.20.4.17	4-287 Water Resources – Groundwater. There are two reference citations of "Carr 2010" that should be changed to "Golder 2010", as noted above.	This change has been noted in Section 12 of the ROD (Errata).
22	4	References	The first reference "Carr, D.A. 2010" (there are two) should be changed to "Golder Associates Inc. 2010" and moved to follow "Golder 2009b". The rest of the reference as written is correct.	This change has been noted in Section 12 of the ROD (Errata).
23	4		There is a strong slant in several places to establish the perceived severity of PM/PM ₁₀ non-attainment issue and ambient windblown dust as the prime contributor in the [project area] (PA). Probably none of this can be changed –but it may be cited during public review as justification for imposing more severe PM controls.	In the analysis in the final EIS, the BLM used the best available data related to nonattainment.
24	4	Section 3.3.2	3-18 LORS is oddly placed. The sub topics are all GHG and Climate Change related. This is probably because the prior LORS section has been almost entirely moved to Ch 4, so that only the GHG rules remain.	Thank you for your comment.
25	4		Do global search and replace several instances of CO ² with CO ₂ .	This change has been noted in Section 12 of the ROD (Errata).
26	4	4.2.1	4-5 As written, this section paints all alternatives with the same brush as far as air permitting and regulatory requirements. This regulatory discussion is appropriate for PA and Alt A and B. But, some specific statements must be inserted to make the key distinction that Sub Alt A1 (PV generation) does NOT trigger the whole slate of county regulations and permitting requirements as PA, Alt A and Alt B. The PV Alternative would trigger only a few federal and county regulatory requirements (including Minor Source permitting) if it turns out that the PV facility will need to have emergency generators or fire water pump engines. Otherwise, none of these rules apply during the PV Alternative operational phase. Setting the PV Alternative apart from the regulatory requirements for other alternatives must also indicate that Table 4.1 outlines requirements for PA, Alt A and Alt B. In contrast, the operational phase for Sub Alt A-1 is not subject the LORS that apply to the operational phase regulations listed in that table (with a few exceptions, again, if emergency engines are installed). Another important factor to be inserted is a distinction between PV and other alternatives as relates to the application-stated [best	Appropriate changes have been noted in Section 12 of the ROD (Errata).

Table G1. Responses to Comments on the Final EIS

Comment No.	Letter No.	Comment	Response		
			<p>available control technology] (BACT) limits. These are not applicable in any way to Sub Alt A1. Again, the text as written ignores this key distinction for PV.</p> <p>For example, insert some statements of the general nature: "Except for the PV generation alternative (Sub Alternative A-1) the SSEP must obtain a Title V permit. . . "</p> <p>The last paragraph of Section 4.2.1 states that as part of the PA, the proponent has committed to meeting de minimis levels of construction emissions" with respect to Conformity Analysis thresholds. The FEIS does not commit the proponent to performing a conformity analysis as a prerequisite to licensing, just to the use of sufficient abatement measures to make the conformity analysis inapplicable.</p>		
27	4	Section 4.2.2.1	4-16	<p>Insert statements here to indicate the discussion of specific project emission calculation assumptions in Section 4.2.2.1 largely apply to those alternatives that involve fuel-burning for supplemental generation. General discussion of construction phase emission sources and mechanisms would apply to PV. However, different assumptions and criteria were applied as appropriate for analysis of project emissions for the PV alternative (Sub Alt A1), as discussed in Section 4.2.6.1. Emission analyses for the operational phase in this section do not apply to the PV alternative.</p>	<p>Appropriate changes have been noted in Section 12 of the ROD (Errata).</p>
28	4	Section 4.2.2.1.1	4-16	<p>The next to last paragraph in this section implies more expansive use of dust palliatives than was intended, in lieu of watering only. As written it can be interpreted as stating that palliatives will be applied on roadways throughout the plant and solar array. For example, "maintenance roads between collector assemblies and other high traffic areas would be treated with dust palliative." Watering is stated to be the adopted dust control measure only for soil areas under the solar collectors.</p>	<p>Table 2.2 of the final EIS includes the following ACEPM: "An approved dust suppression coating would be used on the dirt roadways in and around the solar field." This measure has been carried forward in this decision as a condition of approval.</p>
29	4	Section 4.2.2.2	4-21	<p>Insert a statement in the first paragraph that modeling to assess potential contributions to NAAQS is not applicable to Alternative A-1, as there are no permanent stationary sources involved in that alternative.</p>	<p>Appropriate changes have been noted in Section 12 of the ROD (Errata).</p>

Table G1. Responses to Comments on the Final EIS

Comment No.	Letter No.	Comment	Response		
30	4	Section 4.2.2.3	4-22	Insert a statement in the first paragraph that modeling to assess potential plume visibility contributions is not applicable to Alternative A-1, as there are no permanent stationary sources involved in that alternative.	Appropriate changes have been noted in Section 12 of the ROD (Errata).
31	4	Section 4.2.6.1.1	4-34	The text in this section should present the reduced acreage numbers for Sub Alt A-1, as that explains the reduced construction phase emissions. The values used in the analysis for Alt A-1 are provided in Section 4.3.6.1 (the parallel section on construction GHG emissions in the Climate Change section): "The area cleared during construction under Sub-alternative A1 would be 1,933 acres, 46% less than the 3,600 acres that would be cleared under the Proposed Action."	Appropriate changes have been noted in Section 12 of the ROD (Errata).
32	4	Section 4.2.10	4-40	As in Section 4.2.2.1.1, there is emphasis here on the use of dust palliatives as opposed to water only. If a change is possible here, the text in third and fourth bullet should use the term "water and/or dust palliative" where the term "dust palliative" is used in this text.	Table 2.2 of the final EIS includes the following ACEPM: "An approved dust suppression coating would be used on the dirt roadways in and around the solar field." This measure has been carried forward in this decision as a condition of approval.
33	4	Section 4.2.10	4-40	8th bullet presents the "off site emissions offset" option. Dust suppression to be implemented "as practicable" for off-site roads within 2 miles. Emissions offsets are not required for project that is below Major source levels, even in non-attainment area.	Comment noted. As noted in the Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ's NEPA Regulations, an EIS should consider all relevant, reasonable mitigation measures that could improve the project, even if they are outside the jurisdiction of the BLM.
34	4	Section 4.3.1	4-42	In parallel with Section 4.2.1, this section should include statements that make the distinction that Alternative A-1 would not be subject to MCAQD permitting for GHG, or federal reporting rules as there are no operational fuel-burning sources.	Appropriate changes have been noted in Section 12 of the ROD (Errata).
35	4	Section 4.3.1	4-42	The first sentence of Para 4 must be edited to modify "Under all action alternatives". This statement does not apply to Alt A-1.	Appropriate changes have been noted in Section 12 of the ROD (Errata).
36	4	Table 2.2	2-8	Site Drainage and Runoff Control; we should change the term	This change has been noted in Section 12 of the

Table G1. Responses to Comments on the Final EIS

Comment No.	Letter No.	Comment			Response
				"berm" to "channel."	ROD (Errata).
37	4	Table 2.2	2-8	Site Drainage and Runoff Control; The sentence "The toe of the western protective berm slope may be armored with soil cement cover and riprap to provide for slope erosion protection during a heavy storm event." This does not pertain to this project.	The following sentence has been deleted: "The toe of the western protective berm slope may be armored with soil cement cover and rip rap to provide for slope erosion protection during a heavy storm event." This change has been noted in Section 12 of the ROD (Errata).
38	4	Section 2.5.2.7	2-30	The word "walls" should be replaced with "banks."	This change has been noted in Section 12 of the ROD (Errata).
39	4	Section 2.5.2.10	2-35	We should define "all-weather" as the 100-year event.	The addition of "(capable of handling the 100-year event)" to this sentence after "road" has been noted in Section 12 of the ROD (Errata).
40	4	Section 2.5.3.3	2-41	We are not using a "road berm", change that to "channels."	This change has been noted in Section 12 of the ROD (Errata).
41	4	Section 2.5.3.3	2-41	The sentence "The toe of the western protective berm slope may be armored with soil cement cover and riprap to provide for slope erosion protection during a heavy storm event." This does not pertain to this project.	The following sentence has been deleted: "The toe of the western protective berm slope may be armored with soil cement cover and rip rap to provide for slope erosion protection during a heavy storm event." This change has been noted in Section 12 of the ROD (Errata).
42	4	Figure 2.12	2-59	This exh bit shows the incorrect detention basin sizes, this has been revised.	In the analysis in the final EIS the BLM used the most up to date information provided by Boulevard. Updates to the POD will incorporate revised engineered drawings, as noted in the final EIS.
43	4	Section 3.18.1.2.5	3-109	"Boulevard would consider the Buckeye's drainage requirements through the development process" is misleading. Boulevard would consider these requirements as long as they are not in conflict with other jurisdictions (ie – BLM).	The final EIS notes that Boulevard would only consider them in cases where they do not conflict with other permit requirements. BLM considers the conditions of approval of this ROD to be binding requirements.
44	4	Section 3.18.1.2.5	3-110	This states that "No stormwater drainage system shall be approved if the effect may cause an increase in peak discharge, volume, or velocity of runoff or change the point of entry of drainage onto another property during the runoff event." This is what Buckeye referred to in their comment letter.	Noted.

Table G1. Responses to Comments on the Final EIS

Comment No.	Letter No.	Comment	Response
45	4	Section 4.18.1.3.7 4-223	In the indented paragraph, Site Drainage and Runoff Control–The post-development sediment/detention basin at the discharge points would provide stormwater pollution prevention BMP controls (along with retention time) to reduce the peak off-site discharge and to match pre-development conditions. The road berm and collection channel system would also be constructed to provide site protection from stormwater runoff during a 100-year return storm event. The toe of the western protective berm slope may be armored with soil cement cover and riprap to provide for slope erosion protection during a heavy storm event. Erosion protection may be necessary along portions of the channel collection system, as identified in the hydraulic evaluation. Delete what I have highlighted.
1	5	The following measures are recommended to reduce disturbance of particulate matter, including emissions caused by strong winds as well as machinery and trucks tracking soil off the construction site: Site Preparation and Construction A. Minimize land disturbance; B. Suppress dust on traveled paths which are not paved through wetting, use of watering trucks, chemical dust suppressants, or other reasonable precautions to prevent dust entering ambient air; C. Cover trucks when hauling soil; D. Minimize soil track-out by washing or cleaning truck wheels before leaving construction site; E. Stabilize the surface of soil piles; and F. Create windbreaks. The following measures are recommended to reduce disturbance of particulate matter, including	Thank you for your comments. As noted in Section 7.3.2 of the ROD (Applicable Laws, Ordinances, regulations, and Standards), under this decision the proponent (Boulevard) must comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards (LORS), and must obtain and meet the requirements of all needed permits. The measures referenced are standard approaches to meeting the requirements of Arizona Administrative Code sections you have provided. That code is referenced on page 4-10 of the final EIS. As applicable laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards, the code's rules and stipulations are conditions of approval of the ROD.

Table G1. Responses to Comments on the Final EIS

Comment No.	Letter No. Comment	Response
		<p>emissions caused by strong winds as well as machinery and trucks tracking soil off the construction site:</p> <p>Site Restoration</p> <p>A. Revegetate any disturbed land not used;</p> <p>B. Remove unused material; and</p> <p>C. Remove soil piles via covered trucks.</p> <p>The following rules applicable to reducing dust during construction, demolition and earth moving -activities are enclosed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">o Arizona Administrative Code R18-2-604 through -607o Arizona Administrative Code R18-2-804
