

00001

1

2

3

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND BUREAU

4

OF LAND MANAGEMENT

5

6

7

SOLAR ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

8

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

9

(PEIS)

10

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

11

12

13

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2011

14

CALIENTE, NEVADA

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

00002

1 A P P E A R A N C E S

2 LINDA J. RESSEGUIE

3 Bureau of Land Management

4

5 JANE SUMMERSON

6 U.S. Department of Energy

7

8 HEIDI M. HARTMANN

9 Argonne National Laboratory

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

00003

1

C O N T E N T S

2

Public Scoping Meeting, 2/17/11

3

4

5 PUBLIC COMMENTS

PAGE

6 Kena Gloeckner 5

7 Connie Simkins 9

8 Jeremy Drew 17

9 Cory Lytle 19

10 George T. Rowe 22

11 John Sanders 24

12 Ronda Hornbeck 29

13 Doug Carriger 31

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

00004

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 CALIENTE, NEVADA, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2011

3 7:40 P.M.

4

5 MS HARTMANN: Tonight, a few people did
6 register online to speak tonight through our
7 website and we're going to have those people come up
8 and speak first. Our format for taking comments is
9 that we want to make sure that everyone who's here
10 and wants to make a comment gets their chance. So
11 what we're going to do is first ask everyone to keep
12 their comments to about five minutes. We have
13 plenty of time. We're not going to cut anyone off,
14 but we'd request that it's about five minutes, and
15 then if you haven't been able to say everything you
16 would like, we'll let everybody who wants to speak,
17 go through and then you can come back. Again I'm,
18 not going to stop you. What I'll do is sit in
19 the front row and let you know when you have spoken
20 for five minutes. I'll flash a yellow card and then
21 just try to wrap it up sometime around that time,
22 and then you can come back again if you have more to
23 say.

24 Once again, Rene' is recording the
25 comments. The transcripts will at some point be

00005

1 available on the website and you'll be able to read
2 through them if you like. So if we're ready, we're
3 going to start with the comments.

4 We'll let you choose whether you want to
5 use this microphone or that one.

6 MS. SUMMERSON: Heidi, we do have a
7 request from Rene' that you try to face sort of
8 generally in this direction so that she can hear
9 clearly what is being said. We want to be sure we
10 get a very accurate record of what people are
11 saying. So we would appreciate it if you kind of
12 angle this way to help her out.

13 MS. HARTMANN: The first person who signed
14 up is Kena Gloeckner.

15 MS. GLOECKNER: As a permittee in the Dry
16 Lake Valley North solar energy study area, I have
17 several concerns with the recent draft that's been
18 submitted. First, and foremost, if this area were
19 to be chosen for solar development, our ranching
20 operations could no longer exist. The area north of
21 and including the Simpson allotment represents
22 almost one hundred percent of our winter grazing
23 grounds. In our operation the northern location
24 with its abundant winterfat, serves as a primary
25 locale for the winter grazing season, November

00006

1 through April, and for the early spring calving of
2 our cattle. The Simpson allotment is used during
3 two months of the winter grazing season. This
4 entire area is essential to the existence. Without
5 it, the livelihood of several families would be
6 destroyed. Although the study reveals this area as
7 representing only three percent of the Wilson Creek
8 allotment, this figure is extremely misleading,
9 since this particular allotment contains almost one
10 million acres. Not surprisingly, this land loss
11 would decimate our overall cattle operation, along
12 with four other permittees.

13 Grazing permittees can only run as many
14 livestock as the most limiting portion of their
15 permit. Dry Lake represents our most limiting
16 portion. Since the sustainable number supported on
17 this winter allotment is therefore directly linked
18 to the number of cattle using our summer, spring and
19 fall allotment, these other seasonal areas would
20 also become useless since we would be incapable of
21 running anything close to our current numbers. This
22 land loss would affect 12,163 AUM's directly, but in
23 addition, more than double this amount when
24 considering spring, summer and fall AUM's. The
25 economic impact would be drastic, since it would be

00007

1 impossible to replace this lost natural winter
2 forage with hay or another desirable grazing area,
3 since none are available in our area.

4 Not only do the permittees have grazing
5 allotments in this area, but we also own the water
6 rights for the springs that service this valley.
7 Currently, we have a pipeline network that is over
8 31 miles long and that transports water to five
9 reservoirs in addition to the two wells located at
10 reservoirs within the proposed areas. If this area
11 were approved for solar, we would lose both
12 accessibility and serviceability to our waters.
13 These reservoirs also provide water for the wild
14 horse, deer and antelope herds in the valley.

15 The ensuing consequences for affecting
16 these water rights could prove to be drastic.
17 Again, not only would these particular water rights
18 be affected since the ranchers could show no
19 beneficial use by cattle, the water rights in our
20 other grazing areas -- we own vested rights to
21 almost 50 other springs in the spring and summer
22 allotments -- would detrimentally be affected
23 without the cattle herds to show beneficial use.

24 Furthermore, there would also be adverse
25 social impact and environmental adversities that

00008

1 could occur. The permittees in Dry Lake Valley
2 North are among some of the largest ranches in
3 Lincoln County and have been in the ranching
4 business for almost 150 years. Lincoln County is an
5 economically depressed area, and the ranching
6 industry is a vital element to the economy since it
7 represents one of the major commercial activities in
8 the area. Along with economical effects would come
9 the environmental consequences. For over 150 years
10 the ranchers have been excellent stewards of the
11 land because it, in essence, is their livelihood.

12 The loss of the native white sages in this area as
13 the result of the solar construction would be
14 irreplaceable, since this particular plant is
15 difficult, if not impossible, to re-introduce.

16 Finally, I believe this area is not an
17 ideal location for solar development. In this area
18 is found a very finely-divided soil composed of dust
19 blown by the winds and silt deposited by water.
20 After any disturbance of the surface crust, it
21 easily becomes airborne again. The area is prone to
22 many dust storms and the soil type becomes even more
23 troublesome whenever it's disturbed by travel. In
24 fact, the soil in the valley bottom is classified as
25 highly erodible under the Natural Resources

00009

1 Conservation Services' highly erodible land
2 identification procedures. Additionally, snowfall
3 is sometimes a factor, as is low temperatures. In
4 2007 temperatures in this area reached negative
5 25 degrees.

6 It is my understanding that the Lincoln
7 County Commission supports a proposed solar study
8 area within the Ely Springs cattle grazing allotment
9 since its owner, Vidler Water, has asked to become
10 involved in this project. It is my request that the
11 Dry Lake Valley North study area be redefined to
12 include only this portion, since it would have
13 minimal adverse effects to all involved. Your
14 careful consideration of the concerns expressed in
15 this letter would be greatly appreciated. Thank
16 you.

17 MS. SUMMERSON: Thank you.

18 MS. HARTMANN: Jack Kennedy?

19 MR. KENNEDY: I think I'm good. I'll just
20 sit here.

21 MS. HARTMANN: Is it Paul Long?

22 MR. LONG: No.

23 MS. HARTMANN: No? Okay. Connie Simkins.

24 MS. SIMPKINS: Thank you, very much. For
25 the record, I am Connie Simpkins, a 66-year resident

00010

1 of Lincoln County, Nevada. While I am employed by
2 the Lincoln County Commissioners to watch the Yucca
3 Mountain issue, and I also work for the N-4 Grazing
4 Board since 1976, I speak tonight as a private
5 individual of my own personal recommendations. My
6 statements will be based on my own experiences, the
7 study of this PEIS, scoping comments, administrative
8 draft work, and now on the draft that you've
9 prepared. Of the 11,000-page document I've read
10 about 1,100 pages that concern the Lincoln County
11 area. To save time and avoid repetition, for the
12 record, I support every one of the talking points
13 that the Lincoln County Commissioners will enter
14 into this record in their six-page document tonight,
15 and the written comments they have already submitted
16 in the scoping and the administrative review for
17 reducing the proposed sizes of the three solar
18 energy zones in Lincoln County. I ask you to find
19 suitable only those areas where the landowner and
20 the grazing permit holder has invited you.

21 This document studies a much larger area
22 than the document says is necessary to meet DOE or
23 BLM estimates to support a financially viable solar
24 operation. I ask you to honor the County's
25 commitment for no net loss of AUM's on public land.

00011

1 Require the use of both native and non-native seeds
2 to revegetate the disturbed areas. Permit only
3 projects that provide continued historic and
4 multiple uses that use water-efficient technology
5 and low-elevation construction. Your document does
6 a good job in describing the Native American culture
7 and their values are taken into consideration. It
8 is very difficult for me to describe to you what I
9 consider to be my cultural values that involve my
10 memories, my emotions, my family history, our
11 traditions of five generations of working and
12 playing in these valleys. Words are not adequate to
13 convey the size and depth of the cultural impact a
14 solar project would have on my cultural values.

15 You've asked us for comments on things you
16 find as a void in the draft. Nowhere do I find a
17 description or an assessment of the substations that
18 will be absolutely necessary to put this solar
19 energy onto the new SWIP South line to be sold to
20 our neighbors to the south. You have not included a
21 discussion on the now permitted SWIP South project
22 being built jointly by LS Power and NV Energy. Both
23 these things must be included in your cumulative
24 impact sections for you to have a valid document.

25 In Chapter 7 it describes DOE alternatives

00012

1 and talks about processing permits in a new way to
2 make the time shorter and help them focus where to
3 better spend renewable funds. I am certain you will
4 have a more solid and satisfactory outcome if you
5 will handle each permit on a site-specific basis
6 with full involvement with Lincoln County officials.
7 Chapter 7 talks about the Council of Environmental
8 Quality guidance and the National Environmental
9 Policy Act stipulations that call for review of the
10 past, present and the foreseeable future impacts. I
11 believe the absence of any information on my
12 cultural values does not meet either one of these
13 CEQ or NEPA requirements.

14 I have found a section that I fully agree
15 with in Chapter 7 where you discuss unavoidable
16 adverse impacts. The page has eight bullet points
17 and reveals you do not know how the proposed
18 mitigations might work to delay or defray these
19 unavoidable adverse impacts. It is critical you
20 find unsuitable all areas that contain white sage
21 and deer migration pathways. Permit projects
22 exclusively inside the SEZ areas where you are
23 invited.

24 Chapter 7 describes mitigation being
25 proposed in non-suitable habitats. Two big things

00013

1 can make this work. First, design all mitigations
2 to be monitored and adaptive, so when things go
3 right or wrong, they can be changed for the better.
4 Second, recognize and plan for the fact that the
5 soil, vegetation and water in these valleys are all
6 at critically fragile levels. I'm certain the folks
7 that went on the tour today over the Buckhorn
8 allotment have a first-hand knowledge of that.

9 This document talks about mitigations that
10 DOE will recommend and those that BLM will
11 recommend. I suggest you make sure these two
12 agencies get in the same room around the same table
13 to talk to each other so your plans can be
14 integrated, not opposite or duplicate.

15 In Chapter 2 you discuss the BLM's
16 alternatives and you have two pages of what I call
17 deal killers, or things that, where an area should
18 not be located. And one of them is the existence of
19 an open application for right-of-way in a proposed
20 solar energy zone. I submit to you that you have
21 one in Dry Lake Valley, the very location we're
22 trying to save from possible solar energy projects.
23 It is the right-of-way filed -- Jane, help me -- in
24 2007 by the Department of Energy to build a proposed
25 333-mile railroad from Caliente westward to Yucca

00014

1 Mountain, crossing several allotments from east to
2 west in Dry Lake Valley. Lincoln County has urged
3 the Department of Energy to withdraw this
4 right-of-way, but budgets were cut and work stopped
5 before any action was taken.

6 I know you have already heard in writing
7 from many of these allotment owners that are crossed
8 by the proposed railroad, and I expect you to hear
9 more from them tonight. Please listen and find
10 unsuitable all acres in the SEZ zones where you are
11 not invited. The approximately 10,000 acres that
12 Lincoln County recommends provides enough public
13 lands to support at least three solar, viable solar
14 plants. We heard from a developer, a solar
15 developer today that said they wouldn't need near as
16 much as the acres that are being proposed.

17 Chapter 2 goes on to describe the acres
18 proposed in the different BLM alternatives.
19 Specifically, I refer you to the fact 15 percent of
20 all the SEZ acres are in the six western states
21 right here in Lincoln County, and 58 percent of all
22 of the Nevada acres are right here in Lincoln
23 County. This is an uneven, unwarranted burden on my
24 cultural values.

25 In Chapter 6 the document leaves local

00015

1 coordination out of the minimal environmental impact
2 section as is required by NEPA and CEQ. The
3 document is silent in the minimal social and
4 economic impact section about continued historic
5 public access as an adverse social impact. I agree
6 it's difficult to quantify the social and economic
7 impact, but it's not impossible or unnecessary, it
8 is essential. The document discusses 29 active
9 application projects, six of which are in Lincoln
10 County, or about 20 percent of all Nevada projects.
11 The document is silent on the new gas pipeline being
12 installed today in the I-15 corridor in eastern
13 Lincoln County, obviously with an active
14 right-of-way application. In addition to that
15 application, there are two others in that location;
16 one in this valley for an access road from private
17 land in Lincoln County near Mesquite northwestward
18 to join the already existing main transmission line;
19 the other one is for a proposed natural gas-fired
20 power plant in the Toquop flat area in the North
21 Springs allotment owned by, excuse me, near Bundy.
22 In consultation with a number of interested public
23 land users in this Toquop area we identified
24 numerous conflicts. One prime example would be
25 Gourd Springs, which was organized with a hundred

00016

1 thousand acres several years ago -- Kim?

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Several years ago
3 nearly half of it was taken to protect the turtles.
4 Then in 2005 the western part of this allotment was
5 burned by man-caused fires. Now this document
6 describes taking more than 8,000 additional acres in
7 the center of this allotment for an SEZ. This takes
8 away another 15 percent of his grazing, something
9 this document describes that could make this
10 allotment uneconomical to continue livestock
11 grazing. This brings us down to a complete taking
12 of his 50,000-acre allotment, the forage, the water
13 rights, the range improvements, everything. For
14 these and other considerable conflicts we do not
15 recommend any acres as suitable in the East Mormon
16 SEZ.

17 Water availability. Some of the
18 assumptions on water are out of date and incomplete.
19 Water is a vital resource and should be analyzed in
20 detail.

21 Section 6.6.3, irreversible, irretrievable
22 commitment of resources. My cultural resources are
23 non-renewable and the impact to my life if this
24 commitment of public land is made, will be
25 irreversible and irretrievable and unacceptable.

00017

1 Einstein said it best when he had said, "Nothing
2 rattles alone in this universe. Everything is
3 connected."

4 MS. RESSEGUIE: Thank you both.

5 MS. SIMKINS: I have copies of my
6 presentation here if anybody wants it.

7 MS. HARTMANN: Next we have Jeremy Drew.
8 Jeremy? Don't forget to state your name and your
9 organization.

10 MR. DREW: For the record, my name is
11 Jeremy Drew. I'm a Resource Specialist with
12 Resource Concepts out Carson City, and tonight I'll
13 be representing both Lincoln County and the N-4
14 Grazing Board. Both entities have provided scoping
15 comments and also comments through the
16 administrative processes for cooperating agencies, so
17 I'll try and keep this brief, as we've provided
18 extensive comment and will continue to do so in
19 terms of written comments.

20 I would like to state that both entities
21 support the concept of SEZ approach which you
22 classify as your zone-only alternative rather than
23 the right-of-way process. In order to save time and
24 budget, it takes a lot of time and energy for these
25 local entities to deal with solar right-of-way

00018

1 applications on a case-by-case basis, and we think
2 that the SEZ approach could really limit the amount
3 of time needed to accumulate the local input needed
4 to put these in appropriate places.

5 We do support the SEZs, provided that they
6 are located in the appropriate places and based on
7 local input and support. It should be the goal in
8 order to fit with the Secretary of Interior's Smart
9 from the Start renewable energy initiative. That
10 being said, we think that any renewable energy
11 development should fit the renewable energy goal
12 found within the approved Ely RMP, and just to
13 read that goal to you really quick; goals, renewable
14 energy. Provide opportunities for the development
15 of renewable energy sources such as winds, solar,
16 bio mass and other alternative energy sources, while
17 minimizing adverse impacts to other resources.

18 Lincoln County and the N-4 Grazing Board
19 have serious concerns about potential adverse
20 impacts to resources such as grazing, recreation,
21 vegetation, soils, water resources, cultural and
22 economic impacts, just to name a few. As one
23 example, neither entity agrees or believes that a
24 30-percent reduction in AUM's administered by the
25 Caliente field office qualifies as minimal impact.

00019

1 We do support development within limited portions of
2 the Ely Springs grazing allotment and the Buckhorn
3 allotment; however, we do not support the East
4 Mormon Mountain SEZ, Delamar or Dry Lake North as
5 currently proposed. We also feel that the analysis
6 and listing of cumulative impacts is inadequate. We
7 do believe that both the grazing permittees within
8 the Ely district and Lincoln County are under a lot
9 of stressors from a variety of projects, including
10 the SWIP corridor, the Caliente rail corridor, the
11 Southern Nevada Water Authority pipeline water
12 project, wild fires, power plants and residential
13 developments, just to name a few.

14 Again, we will provide extensive written
15 comment on it, but I wanted to hit on a few high
16 points tonight. Thanks for your time.

17 MS. RESSEGUIE: Thank you.

18 MS. HARTMANN: Cory Lytle.

19 MR. LYTLE: For the record, I'm Cory
20 Lytle. I'm representing two entities tonight. The
21 first would be the Lincoln County Planning and
22 Building Department, and the second will be the Lincoln
23 County Advisory Board managing wildlife. Formal
24 comment, you guys are getting formal comments. I
25 don't have any written, it's going to be more of a

00020

1 generalized set of statements. First and foremost,
2 from the County planning perspective and County
3 building perspective, we see this as a programmatic
4 document in one hand, but then you read in the
5 document, several issues that come and hit directly
6 home. Issues such as complete grazing allotments
7 being shut down. Wildlife corridors being
8 completely cut off. And so from a programmatic
9 viewpoint it takes the programmatic right out of the
10 situation and goes and hits right directly to a
11 site-specific situation, which is going to have to
12 be analyzed down the road, anyway. And so I would
13 like to kind of break that out and just emphasize
14 the fact that the County on the planning standpoint,
15 and through the County Commissioners and the local
16 viewpoints that come in on this, we would like to
17 take the site-specific impacts as they come on
18 particular projects.

19 We have a public lands policy that is soon
20 to be enacted. Projects will come through a process
21 through the County and we will still have to go
22 through and analyze every single project that comes
23 through. Keeping in mind, the County still supports
24 the SEZ program and the SEZ approach. We would
25 still like to go back to that initial proposal that

00021

1 the County had over two years ago, basically to
2 streamline the process, to shorten up the process.
3 And, you know, it steps right back to Secretary
4 Salazar's Smart from the Start approach. We see
5 this programmatic EIS come out and it hits home when
6 it goes as broad-based as some of the situations
7 that are there, and then you see site specific
8 issues on site-specific range allotments,
9 site-specific wildlife corridors, things of that
10 nature being thought of as being eliminated as a
11 type of a solution.

12 Secondly, as kind of a side note on that,
13 you've heard lots of things about the cultural
14 resources, cultural things of that nature. It's a
15 close-knit community. And from the beginning, the
16 process has been we get the County Commissioners, we
17 go to the local leaders, we get the local grazing
18 operators involved, we get the local wildlife,
19 sports, or local wildlife specialists involved, and
20 we work out the issues from the ground up, not from
21 the top down. And it seems to be a lot more
22 effective that way in regard to those types of
23 projects. We're getting bombarded left and right
24 with these types of projects. And it's very scary
25 when you're staring out your window and there's

00022

1 another project coming down the road. And so we
2 just have to deal with that.

3 Kind of a broad comment from a wildlife
4 standpoint, the Dry Lake North SEZ has a lot of mule
5 deer migration issues in it, a lot of mule deer
6 wintering issues in it. It's a year-round antelope
7 habitat, antelope area. We just want to see some of
8 those ideas stated, some of those things directly
9 addressed. We don't believe that the Dry Lake North
10 SEZ is adequate. We think it needs to be reduced to
11 the original proposal. Thanks.

12 MS. HARTMANN: Tom Rowe?

13 MR. ROWE: My name is George T. Rowe. My
14 friends call me Tommy. As Connie mentioned, the
15 County Commission has submitted their remarks for
16 the record. I'm just here today to thank the
17 Caliente office of the BLM for working with us on
18 these projects and the Ely district office for
19 working with us. And I'd like to thank the people
20 from Washington that came here and hope that they,
21 too, will work with us.

22 We would like the assurance that none of
23 our residents, our permittees and our citizens that
24 run this land with their cattle will be
25 affected. I'd like to thank the residents that are

00023

1 here today for coming out to express their thoughts.
2 We have had the government take a lot of our land
3 away from us, starting out with the restrictions
4 that we first had on the Test Site. And then back
5 in the late '70's we all remember the Groom Mountain
6 withdrawal that took 87,000 acres of public land
7 from Lincoln County residents. It's been fenced and
8 guarded now. We have no access to it. The
9 wilderness that was just taken away, or just made
10 into wilderness covered right around 720,000 acres
11 of Lincoln County. We lost many, many roads in this
12 area. We don't have access to this area anymore.

13 There was a few roads that were cherry stemmed in,
14 but we do not have access to them anymore, except
15 for the small amounts that were cherry stemmed in.

16 We would like and request that the areas
17 for this solar project be reduced to the amount that
18 is necessary. We've had developers that were on our
19 tour today state that this is way more land than is
20 necessary to come up with the power that is
21 generated. This is all I have to say, and I hope
22 that you would work with us as the BLM locally has.

23 Thank you.

24 MS. RESSEGUIE: Thank you.

25 MS. HARTMANN: John Sanders?

00024

1 MR. SANDERS: My name is John Sanders.
2 I'm the general manager for Delamar Valley Cattle,
3 ranching community in Delamar Valley, also up in
4 White Pine County. I'd like to start by thanking
5 those that came on the tour today to see the
6 Buckhorn allotment. It helps when you get a little
7 dirt on your feet and you can see what's out there.
8 Hopefully, it is the basis for some understanding
9 from where we're coming from. I'd like to thank the
10 N-4 Grazing Board and the Lincoln County Board of
11 Commissioners for helping to facilitate that
12 particular tour.

13 An overall view, it's been mentioned a
14 little bit, Delamar Valley Cattle has been under
15 quite a bit of pressure in the last few years. The
16 entire Delamar Valley, or Delamar Mountain
17 Wilderness Area, 155 to 160,000 acres, sits on our
18 permits. That's a bit restricted in the way we can
19 manage and use that, how we can access it. Along
20 with that, we have two proposed power lines, water
21 line from White Pine County going to Vegas that will
22 be going through this very same sensitive area. So
23 we are a little bit tender to more proposals,
24 especially when a proposal comes through that
25 declares itself to be exclusive to all other land

00025

1 uses, as it has been.

2 We also are in this renewable natural
3 energy movement with a wind generating on our
4 Bastion Creek allotment and Shell office on the
5 north end of the ranch in Spring Valley. So we're
6 getting hit from several sides on a lot of this
7 stuff. As we talked about in the tour today, this
8 white sage country is critical to our ranching
9 operation. If you look at the area of that Delamar
10 PEIS zone, you can draw a line right where the white
11 sage grows and that is exactly what has been
12 earmarked. The white sage is of critical importance
13 because of its productivity, its nutritional value
14 for the cattle, as well as for its palatability.
15 There are a lot of other ground species that have
16 equal energy and are equally digestible.
17 Unfortunately, the animals don't like to eat it. So
18 it really has very little value.

19 I think we talked a little bit about how
20 fragile that environment is out there, the soil
21 types and how very little traffic will completely
22 eliminate the white sage. And then we discussed a
23 little bit about how some fires in the early, in the
24 last century destroyed some white sage stands that
25 have yet to regenerate. They do not reestablish and

00026

1 they will not reestablish under our present climatic
2 conditions. So I think it's important that we look
3 at it, because as long as the plant is not
4 disturbed, if it's just grazed it is a renewable
5 natural resource. If it's destroyed entirely, it
6 will not be renewed.

7 I think another important thing to talk
8 about is the impacts on the AUM's. One of the
9 documents I saw had an estimate, I visited a little
10 bit with Mr. May about how that number was arrived
11 at, but they had an estimate of 606 AUM's lost in
12 that allotment. If you look at the allotment, with
13 60 percent of it not being accessed by the cattle
14 because lack of water and lack of ability to haul
15 water, and you talk about the 30,000 acres down in
16 the white sage flat, you know, it's well over half
17 of the usable AUM's in that allotment. And so we
18 would suffer from a business standpoint greatly with
19 the loss of that.

20 With the loss of the AUM's would be the
21 loss of certificated water sources in the form of
22 reservoirs. Also, the loss of access through and
23 across that country, the rest of our grazing
24 operation in that allotment would be severely
25 impacted because we would lose our ability to

00027

1 distribute the cattle because there would not be
2 water in certain areas. If we look at the
3 management where we might be able to move cattle in
4 those allotments, if it was exclusively fenced and
5 we had to push cattle ten or 12 miles south and go
6 two or three miles across, and then ten or 12 miles
7 north again to get to a trail that was originally
8 three miles from where we originally started, you
9 know, the labor input and wear and tear on the
10 cattle and cowboys makes it pretty hard.

11 There are a number of facilities that we
12 would lose. We have corrals out, a couple of
13 different corral sites out in that PEIS. Without
14 those, then we have to push cattle 12, 13, 14 miles
15 to get to another place where we could carry out our
16 management practices.

17 I think the last thing I would like to get
18 on the record is the socioeconomic impact. I know a
19 lot of times we get lumped in with Las Vegas and
20 Clark County. You know, Lincoln County is a unique
21 county. It's unique, and that's the reason most of
22 us live here, is because of the lifestyle that we
23 enjoy and the resources that we have available to
24 us. I know in Clark County it's, about 14 percent
25 of their economy is derived from agriculture. Here

00028

1 it's 45 to 50 percent. That makes us very critical
2 to Lincoln County. We were talking about maybe
3 30 percent loss of AUM's in the AUM's administered
4 by the Caliente field office. If you lose
5 30 percent of something that's 45 percent of your
6 economy, that's pretty critical.

7 I think it's important that we don't lump
8 Lincoln County in with the Clark County
9 demographics. If we wanted to live in Clark County
10 and we wanted to be with them, we would be down
11 there. There's plenty of houses available. Anyway,
12 it's a good deal right now. But I do appreciate the
13 conversations that we've had and the opportunity
14 we've had to discuss some of these issues that are
15 important from a local standpoint that you would
16 only know of if you get out and get a little Lincoln
17 County dirt on your feet. But it's a very fragile
18 area. It is a good resource for cattle. It will
19 not stand up to a lot of other uses. And so I would
20 like to encourage that we, that we isolate these
21 kind of projects onto those private properties in
22 the county where they want it, maybe on to the Ely
23 Springs allotment where they invite it, but I would
24 ask that you do not earmark any of the other
25 allotments for this kind of a deal because it just

00029

1 isn't conducive with our lifestyle, with our
2 County's economy, and as well as the environment.
3 And as a cattleman I consider myself to be a
4 conservationist, and I would really hate to see
5 those white sage flats turn into a dust bowl. And
6 that's the kind of traffic that would be involved
7 that these projects would create. And there's no
8 way to avoid it. Thank you.

9 MS. RESSEGUIE: Thank you.

10 MS. HARTMANN: Ronda Hornbeck.

11 MS. HORNBECK: Ronda Hornbeck. I am a
12 concerned citizen in Lincoln County. I am a past
13 Lincoln County Commissioner. During the time that I
14 was commissioner we worked very hard on trying to
15 work with our citizens in Lincoln County on what
16 could be a workable situation for solar within our
17 county. And that's one thing that I would encourage
18 BLM to look at. You guys have maps sitting in front
19 of you. You have squares, you have diagonals, you
20 have lines on a piece of paper. This County is more
21 than just a line on a piece of paper. And what's
22 really hard is when you are back in Washington, D.C.
23 looking at those lines on a piece of paper, it would
24 be like this group of people looking at lines of
25 Washington, D.C. and us making a determination for

00030

1 you guys there on what would be the best for you in
2 your region of the world.

3 You've heard a lot of comments tonight.

4 I'm sure you've received a lot of comments. One
5 thing this county did is it got very proactive. We
6 went out and we got ranchers and concerned citizens
7 within the county, we got NDOW, we got people from
8 all different realms of the county and the different
9 concerns and we had meetings throughout the county.

10 We talked about what was out there, what could be
11 mitigated, what could be worked with, what would be
12 the best and what absolutely was not going to work,
13 and we came up with an acreage. And you guys have
14 been presented with that from the County

15 Commissioners of what would be the best suitable
16 acres that would work for this county. What they
17 ask is that you take that into consideration. Not
18 the lines on the map, not what you in Washington
19 feel like is the best scenario for us in Lincoln

20 County, but take what this county has to offer, the
21 information that it has to give to you, the
22 information that is coming from your ranchers, the
23 information that is coming from NDOW, the
24 information that is coming from the group of people
25 that have to live and exist in this county. We're

00031

1 asking to you take that into consideration, not the
2 lines on the map. These are real people that you're
3 working with. These are the existence of a rancher.
4 These are the existence of the people. This is the
5 existence of the County Commission that has to deal
6 with this. We don't have the resources that some of
7 the bigger areas have to deal with it. We deal with
8 the people that's going to volunteer their time,
9 that's going to work with the Commission, that's
10 going to work with the BLM on this direction. They
11 have given you the best help you guys could ever
12 get, and that is the group of people that live here,
13 that exist here and have given you the information
14 that says listen to us, this is the best area.
15 Don't consider the huge solar PEIS that's out there
16 right now. Listen to what the people have to say.
17 Don't look at the lines on the map. Thank you.

18 MS. RESSEGUIE: Thank you.

19 MS. HARTMANN: Is there anyone else that
20 would like to give a statement?

21 MR. CARRIGER: Doug Carriger, resident of
22 Lincoln County. I had a question earlier. I
23 thought I heard it said that about 25 percent of the
24 solar lands would be public lands, which means
25 75 percent would be private lands; is that true?

00032

1 MS. RESSEGUIE: I wasn't going to use this
2 part of the meeting to answer questions.

3 MR. CARRIGER: Well, I'll tell you what I
4 heard, that's what I heard.

5 MS. RESSEGUIE: Yeah.

6 MR. CARRIGER: And so my clarification
7 would be, what are private lands?

8 MS. SUMMERSON: Well.

9 MR. CARRIGER: The private lands in
10 Lincoln County that might be available for solar
11 production are 15,000 or less acres. 25 percent and
12 it's balanced as public lands, it's much less than
13 you propose in Lincoln County. So you need to get
14 your facts straight.

15 MS. RESSEGUIE: Thank you.

16 MS. HARTMANN: If there are no more
17 speakers, we are going to now end the formal meeting and we
18 aren't recording comments, but we'll be here
19 for as long as anyone wants to talk, so.

20 (Whereupon, proceedings were concluded at
21 8:30 p.m.)

22

23

24

25

00033

1 STATE OF NEVADA)

2) ss:

COUNTY OF CLARK)

3

4 I, Rene' Hannah, Certified Court Reporter,

5 for the State of Nevada do hereby certify:

6 That I reported stenographically the
7 proceedings had and testimony adduced at the
8 proceedings held in the foregoing matter on the 1st
9 day of March, 2011; that my stenotype notes were
10 later transcribed into type-writing under my
11 direction, and the foregoing 32 pages contain a true
12 and complete record of the proceedings had and
13 testimony adduced at said hearing.

14 Dated at Las Vegas, Nevada, on the 1st day
15 of March of 2011.

16

17

18

19 RENE' R. HANNAH, CCR NO. 326

20

21

22

23

24

25