

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 WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2011

14 GOLDFIELD, 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, 2/16/11

3

4

5 PUBLIC COMMENTS

PAGE

6

Richard Arnold 4

7

Larry Johnson 10

8

Eric Petlock 14

9

Herb Roberts 17

10

Sandra Johnson 19

11

Dominic Pappalardo 20

12

13

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 GOLDFIELD, NEVADA, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2011

3 7:30 P.M.

4

5 MS. HARTMANN: Right now, I will call the
6 first person. When you come up, if you could just
7 sign in and say that you are going to comment at the
8 front desk. If you could write your name here, I'm
9 not sure that's the case for everyone here. We have
10 Richard, who is going to speak, and there were a
11 couple of other people who signed up to speak on the
12 website. I'm not sure if they're here. After
13 Richard speaks, I will call and see. Is there
14 anyone besides Richard? Okay. We'll have both of
15 you. We generally try to keep the comments to about
16 five minutes, but we've got plenty of time, so
17 you'll be able to finish your statement. Thank you.

18 Richard Arnold from the Pahrump Paiute
19 Tribe.

20 MS. RESSEGUIE: For this we're going to
21 turn it a little bit so Richard can address his
22 comments to DOE and BLM.

23 MR. ARNOLD: My name is Richard Arnold.
24 I'm Southern Paiute Pahrump Tribe and also the
25 spokesperson for the Consolidated Group of Tribes

00005

1 and Organizations. The organization is actually
2 combined of 17 different Indian Tribes from Nevada,
3 California, Utah and Arizona. We deal primarily
4 with Southern Paiutes, Western Shoshone, and Owens
5 Valley Paiute and Shoshone folks. One of the -- I
6 guess I'll first start out by addressing some of the
7 concerns to some of the EIS documents that really,
8 and under the cultural resources section, that
9 really the information in there is based upon very
10 limited consultation with only about four tribes, as
11 I understand it, from talking about a variety of
12 some of the solar projects in Nevada here. And to
13 us, it actually is omitting several different tribes
14 that have cultural historic ties that I think really
15 need to be re-evaluated and to bring those into a
16 current ethnographic study that is being conducted.
17 Even though the Draft EIS is out, this document can
18 still be an important part of that because if we as
19 a tribe, just as everybody else, the earlier you get
20 into the process, the better. We're talking about
21 the Draft EIS and it has some standing for over 20
22 years or whatever. Or, no. There's something about
23 20 years. But we're talking about the life of the
24 EIS, looking at what is being proposed, that once
25 the information is presented and once the Record of

00006

1 Decision comes out, then it becomes kind of the
2 foundation for future progress. So we want to make
3 sure that we are, our needs are being addressed and
4 at least considered in the document and being
5 documented appropriately. I, in fact, was supposed
6 to come up here last night to the Las Vegas meeting.
7 I didn't do that, but because this issue is so
8 important I drove 150 miles from Pahrump. And
9 actually, I've been in Parker, Arizona, so much more
10 than that. Probably the last six or seven hours of
11 driving with two hours of sleep after a long night
12 of singing at a funeral. I'm one of the Salt
13 singers that we use. We need to sing our souls of
14 people that pass on to certain points. And it's
15 very key and germane to this conversation because
16 one of the key points is Mt. Charleston and the
17 Spring Mountains. So that is the origin spot of
18 the Southern Paiute people. By a crow's fly it's
19 about 20 miles from Amargosa Valley. And so it
20 falls within the region of influence for all of
21 Southern Paiutes in Utah, Nevada, Arizona and in
22 California, including the Chemehuevi people down by
23 the Colorado River.

24 Once these kind of projects happen, we
25 have to really be critical of them and really

00007

1 evaluate them to make sure that it's not going to
2 impact our cultural and religious resources or our
3 way of getting onto the afterlife. You know,
4 there's certain song sites and story sites and
5 trails that are all throughout Amargosa Valley that
6 have not even been evaluated. Respectfully, the
7 Timbisha Shoshone, they were able to be brought in
8 for the ones in Amargosa, but we're actually, as I
9 mentioned to you earlier, we're 60 miles away from
10 Death Valley, but we're only 15 to 20 miles away
11 from Amargosa Valley. So we're actually close. So
12 we need to make sure that those needs are again,
13 being addressed.

14 We also see an issue, I'm very curious and
15 maybe going to share some further comments on
16 environmental injustices in the NEPA section of the
17 DEIS -- the PEIS, I'm sorry, the Draft PEIS, that we
18 believe that a lot of those type of projects are
19 being sited close to low-income minority Tribal
20 reservations that have impact so that again, aren't
21 being fairly evaluated.

22 We also believe that, we know that there's
23 a lot of important cultural resource sites. And as
24 I was sharing with Linda earlier, part of this
25 process is we're trying to identify things that can

00008

1 be considered so we don't have necessarily
2 show-stoppers. And I have to say as a native person
3 that there is a real big push and this is a
4 politically-charged program and project, clearly.
5 But clean energy, just because people say it's clean
6 doesn't necessarily mean that it's green.

7 It's kind of interesting and ironic when
8 we're talking about this. It's like okay to do
9 those, but yet if you ask for a copy of the EIS, it
10 costs too much money. So we can't do that because
11 we're looking at the Paper Reduction Act and all
12 these other things. And I understand all that, but
13 it's also very important that people need to
14 understand that the impact, that the resources are
15 out there. The land that is out there, a lot of
16 these projects were being proposed for are actually
17 in pristine areas. People look at it, and at the
18 tortoises and see Nevada as a wasteland. For us
19 that live here and this is our home, we know that
20 it's not.

21 There are traditional gathering areas,
22 places where we still use, we go to collect our
23 traditional medicines and things that are needed.
24 And so unless we're talking about that up front, we
25 don't want to come back with mitigation issues,

00009

1 saying okay, well, let's try to address this or
2 let's not do subsequent studies and say, okay, we're
3 going to bring in tribes later. We really need to
4 be brought in as early as possible into this
5 process, hopefully, under the current study that's
6 being done in Nevada.

7 Let me see here. The other part of this
8 is although it's not solar, but it's a green
9 project, with the cooperating agencies that were
10 down there, I know the Forest Service is also
11 entertaining, looking at wind power in some of the
12 national recreation areas and National Forests.
13 They're looking at ways that they can try to address
14 their concerns. Again, it's one of those things
15 that all of the, the public and the tribes, they're
16 always inundated with all these different documents.
17 And even though it's a very voluminous document, the
18 EIS, I do read them. I read the entire thing. So
19 with the tribes that we're dealing with, and
20 actually, we're trying to respond to some of the
21 questions earlier was we would like to get, I need
22 to get a hard copy of the document, certainly with
23 the emphasis on Chapters 1 through 7 and 11, which
24 focuses on Nevada. And because of the Southern
25 Paiute connection and the other tribes that we

00010

1 interface with, and the cultural ties to Spring
2 Mountains and Mt. Charleston, we are also going to
3 need the Arizona and California and Utah sections.
4 I know it's going to be a big, basically, it's
5 everything but Colorado, I think. Is that the only
6 other one?

7 MS. RESSEGUIE: And New Mexico.

8 MR. ARNOLD: And New Mexico. Thank you.
9 And New Mexico. So those are the ones that we need
10 to make sure that we're a part of, a part of this
11 process. And again, we appreciate the efforts and
12 opportunity to be able to come out and present our
13 views. Hopefully, they'll be considered and they'll
14 not fall upon deaf ears. We're also hoping that,
15 again, and pleading with you that for purposes of
16 the Pahrump Paiute Tribe that we really need to be
17 involved in the ethnographic study that's currently
18 underway. Thank you.

19 MS. RESSEGUIE: Thank you.

20 MS. HARTMANN: State your name.

21 MR. JOHNSON: Sure. I'm Larry Johnson.
22 Reno, Nevada. Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife.
23 About a year ago I got asked by Senator Reid's staff
24 to become involved in a collaborative process to
25 identify acceptable areas for solar energy

00011

1 development. And that was in Lincoln County. It
2 was kind of an interesting process because the
3 County Commissioners have kind of started the
4 process and they had gotten ranchers involved to
5 determine where their prime grazing allotments were,
6 where areas within those grazing allotments were not
7 as important and could be, the ranchers could
8 survive without those areas. Department of Wildlife
9 biologists were here and pointed out areas of
10 critical mule deer winter range and in fact, hills
11 where the critical migration corridors was lower
12 from hills where, should be withdrawn and should not
13 be considered within these zones. I think
14 wilderness advocates were there, range people, mining
15 people. Off-road enthusiasts were there.
16 Representative Heller's staff was well-represented
17 there. The impact of this was the development of
18 County recommendations for where these solar
19 projects should be located, and they're based upon
20 local knowledge and local input, how it impacts the
21 local economy, the off-road recreation, the wildlife,
22 the off-road travel, whatever. You know, it's kind
23 of disappointing to see that when those maps were
24 presented to BLM, those do not change their maps.
25 That the areas that were identified as critical to

00012

1 the locals were not heeded.

2 And my point in this is your zones have
3 not been selected with local knowledge by local
4 people. I don't know by looking at those maps how
5 many ranchers are going to be potentially put out of
6 business by canceling grazing allotments to make
7 room for solar energy. I don't think the BLM could
8 tell me probably an answer to that at this point,
9 either. Possibly you could, okay, but it is along
10 the lines of the last gentleman that spoke. Unless
11 these processes come from the ground up from the
12 people who know and live on this land, this process
13 is not well-served when people sit behind a computer
14 station hundreds of miles away looking at GIS
15 layers, okay? It's not. I realize it takes a lot
16 more effort and a lot more work, but this process
17 with the programmatic EA will clear the way for an
18 energy developer to come in here and probably
19 process a project with an environmental assessment
20 not under the EIS, okay, which is a much less
21 in depth document.

22 The tendency will be, if these impacts are
23 not identified at this time and these zones and
24 boundaries are not altered accordingly, we get zero,
25 is really our issue. I think you're going to be

00013

1 presented tomorrow night, once again, hard copies of
2 those, of the County analysis.

3 MS. RESSEGUIE: Okay.

4 MR. JOHNSON: And I think you're on a
5 field tour tomorrow to look at some of those
6 conflicts between what the County recommended and
7 what BLM has included in this Draft PEIS. That is
8 something I would like everybody local to be aware
9 of.

10 MS. JOHNSON: Where is this meeting
11 tomorrow?

12 MR. JOHNSON: Caliente.

13 MS. JOHNSON: Caliente.

14 MR. JOHNSON: And again, I would urge and
15 in fact after these meetings are over, I'm going to
16 once again, contact Senator Reid and Representative
17 Heller and say, "Okay. You asked me to get involved
18 in this mess here. We need that ground-up movement
19 not top-down dictation." Thank you.

20 MS. RESSEGUIE: Thank you.

21 MS. HARTMANN: We did have a couple people
22 who signed up online. Is Jeff Pauley here?

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He wasn't able to attend.

25 MS. HARTMANN: Okay. And then Eric Petlock.

00014

1

2 MR. PETLOCK: Eric Petlock. I work for a
3 lot of different, mostly wildlife and
4 sportsman-oriented organizations. And that's kind
5 of how I got involved in this. And I think I would
6 like to just echo what the last two gentlemen have
7 said, and that is in working at -- I've been here in
8 Nevada working on all of these issues for a number
9 of years, now and one of the common themes that
10 comes up over and over is that because 87 percent of
11 Nevada is Federal land, a lot of the people who live
12 here in Nevada oftentimes feel like that the big
13 decisions are made somewhere else, in Washington or
14 God knows where, and then they sort of get imposed
15 from the top down.

16 And the people who actually live here and
17 who make their living either ranching or recreation,
18 hunting, fishing or whatever, those people are the
19 ones that end up sort of taking the brunt of
20 whatever those policy decisions are. And that theme
21 comes up over and over and over. And I've been all
22 over the state. I've talked to sportsmen all over
23 the state and that is probably one of the most
24 common, recurring themes.

25 So in this particular situation here with

00015

1 the several alternatives that have been presented
2 and the discussions that I've had with a lot of
3 people about these, I think there's a lot of support
4 for the zones approach, saying let's put these solar
5 energy developments in areas that we know are going
6 to be, you know, low-impact to wildlife, to
7 recreation, to cultural sites, you know, et cetera.

8 The concept is a great concept and I don't
9 think you're going to find very many people that are
10 going to disagree with the concept. The problem is
11 the execution of the concept. And so far, I think
12 the consensus is that the development of these zones
13 is incomplete. What we have right now is sort of a
14 good idea and a start, but it's not the finished
15 product. And unless BLM, the Department of Interior
16 and Department of Energy adopt this approach of
17 coming in and taking the time and spending the
18 energy to learn what the local concerns are and use
19 local knowledge and local input to help design these
20 zones, make sure that these zones are actually
21 created properly, what will end up happening is you
22 will end up with the same problems within the zones
23 that you're trying to avoid in the first place. It
24 will just become a much more legally complicated
25 issue.

00016

1 So I think that would be the thing that
2 I'd like to offer, is let's go back and say this is
3 a good idea, we're off to a good start, but local
4 input has to be the foundation of this rather than
5 sort of something that happens as kind of an
6 afterthought. Or worse yet, that it's done in a way
7 that doesn't really accomplish any purpose.

8 I think we've, I've had conversations
9 with biologists from the Nevada Department of
10 Wildlife, and I'm not talking about just local field
11 biologists, but people in the top positions who have
12 said, "We really haven't been consulted that much on
13 this." I mean, in terms of really defining zones or
14 understanding, well, this particular area has some,
15 you know, there's a mule deer herd that winters here
16 or there's a migration route where bighorn sheep
17 migrate from this mountain range to that mountain
18 range. Those are the kinds of things that we need
19 to be able to really have as part of the process,
20 rather than just saying, "Okay. Well, we've got
21 these zones and we think these are pretty good," and
22 then not really fully vet those zones.

23 Thank you for your time.

24 MS. HARTMANN: We don't have anyone else
25 who is signed up to speak, but if anyone would like

00017

1 to make a comment.

2 MR. ROBERTS: Question? I don't need the
3 mic. I'm pretty loud. Concerns, I've heard a
4 couple times here already, local, local, local.
5 It's true. We represent Gold Point. Not a large
6 community, yet nonetheless, a community that really
7 doesn't want to see a sea of glass out in front of
8 them. But that being beside the point, because
9 government is going to do what it wants, I
10 understand, and correct me if I'm wrong, is this a
11 choice between Gold Point or Miller's, or are you
12 going to do both? That's my first question to
13 clarify me. Are we having an input here? Are you
14 choosing between Miller's and Gold Point?

15 MS. RESSEGUIE: No.

16 MR. ROBERTS: Are you doing both?

17 MS. RESSEGUIE: We are looking at both.

18 MR. ROBERTS: Okay.

19 MS. RESSEGUIE: We are analyzing both. We
20 are considering both, not either/or.

21 MR. ROBERTS: Considering both at the same
22 time, but maybe one before the other? It just seems
23 to me that Nye County on the other side of Highway
24 95 is going forward with their solar project; is
25 that right, Tom?

00018

1 MR. SELEY: Yep.

2 MR. ROBERTS: Okay. Miller's is on the
3 other side of the highway. It just makes more sense
4 that the grid and everything else appear to be in
5 place and nobody lives at Miller's other than the
6 rest stop across the road. The impact for the
7 locals is going to be a lot less. If I could at
8 least put that two cents in. If you have to do
9 both, at least do Miller's first and wait 50 years.

10 MS. RESSEGUIE: 20.

11 MR. ROBERTS: Excuse me, 20 years. I know
12 that someday green is the answer and I have no
13 problem with green, with the solar energy. And we
14 are going to have to do something. But why does it
15 have to be next to any community of any size rather
16 than -- for four years I have traveled all over
17 Nevada. I've seen a lot of open areas. And I know
18 you guys have got your criteria as to why to choose
19 certain areas, but goodness, why next to any
20 community when there are other areas where
21 absolutely nobody lives other than the people who
22 drive by from point A to point B? So that's pretty
23 much my comment.

24 MS. RESSEGUIE: Could you give us your
25 name, because I think we have your comments.

00019

1 MR. ROBERTS: Herb Roberts, Gold Point,
2 Nevada. I've been 32 years here.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Also, your map
4 shows that it comes right up to the border of town
5 of Gold Point. It looks like it's right, like it
6 comes right into our town.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Make sure that
8 those are the prospective zones. Doesn't mean it's
9 coming right next to the town.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Are we going to
11 have to see it driving in and out of town?

12 MS. RESSEGUIE: If you can see that spot,
13 which I don't know. Tom, you've probably never
14 been, I've never been out there so I don't actually,
15 I have not actually seen that, but if you could see
16 the spot driving by, then you would be able to see
17 the facility.

18 MR. ROBERTS: We'd see everything. We
19 live up.

20 MS. JOHNSON: It wipes out the whole view.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I've seen Kramer's
22 Junction. It will look horrible. You know, it's
23 great for Kramer's Junction. There's nothing there.
24 We've got a picturesque ghost town.

25 MS. JOHNSON: A lot of the landscape

00020

1 surrounding our area is a beautiful landscape. And
2 it is going to totally ruin it. We have lacking
3 cell service there to start with. What is a
4 600-foot tower, if that's what they plan on putting
5 in, what is it going to do to our cell service out
6 there? What will it do to our satellite TV? We've
7 got a lot of issues here. You're going to need
8 water out there.

9 MS. JOHNSON: My name is Sandra Johnson,
10 if you need that.

11 MR. PAPPALARDO: I'm Dominic Pappalardo
12 for Esmeralda County Commissioner, District One,
13 which is here in Goldfield. And I'm on the Land Use
14 Advisory Committee for over two years now working
15 with Tom and others. We've been looking at these
16 issues and one of my questions, it's now my
17 understanding these zones are locked in place,
18 that's why we're having these meetings; is that not
19 true?

20 MS. RESSEGUIE: The zones, I'm not sure
21 what you mean by locked in place, but the decision
22 about whether to designate these proposed areas as
23 solar energy zones has not been made.

24 MR. PAPPALARDO: Right. That was my
25 understanding, so that's why we are having these

00021

1 meetings?

2 MS. RESSEGUIE: That's why we're having
3 these meetings, yes.

4 MR. PAPPALARDO: You spent some time with
5 Dave Sweetman about a month or so ago. Did he show
6 you some places on the map that we discussed that
7 might be some good locations?

8 MR. SELEY: He showed what we're proposing
9 is the public lands use policy plans for Esmeralda
10 County of an energy park.

11 MR PAPPALARDO: Right. I don't know how
12 that fits in with the energy companies, but that is
13 hid behind the mountain range and it wouldn't be
14 issued for Gold Point, right?

15 MR. SELEY: Right. That's not an issue
16 for Gold Point. It's an issue we can reevaluate in
17 the land use plans provisions that some of the
18 criteria we used -- everyone here knows how we
19 select this. We did have fairly short working time
20 on it, but we went through the process, we looked
21 for lands that had up to one percent slope,
22 relatively flat. We looked for locations that were
23 near or right on the western energy corridor which
24 was analyzed in another EIS. We looked for
25 threatened/endangered species, we looked at mining

00022

1 claims, we looked at gas leases, geothermal leases,
2 wild horse/burro areas, military training areas,
3 tried to find a location where all of those were not
4 going to be conflicts.

5 MR. PAPPALARDO: Right. So a couple other
6 areas, I'd like to give them to you on a map so you
7 guys can consider them in the light of the,
8 there is a little bit of water probations for that.

9 MR. SELEY: About 75-acre feet per acre.
10

11 MR. PAPPALARDO: Not a lot. They may have
12 to buy some appropriation, but one area in Esmeralda
13 where we have the most water available is by the
14 marsh, salt marsh up there by Goldfield Junction,
15 and there's a transmission right-of-way. I don't
16 know when that would be put, the transmission
17 right-of-way, but basically it's parallel to the
18 project.

19 MR. SELEY: There's a corridor that runs
20 right through there.

21 MR. PAPPALARDO: All right. To me, that
22 is an excellent area you guys can use for the, you
23 have there now, that plant.

24 MR. SELEY: The conflict we run into
25 there, we have mining claimed stakes across the

00023

1 entire salt marsh from mountain to mountain.

2 MR. PAPPALARDO: Oh, really?

3 MR. SELEY: At that time we did the
4 analysis the Yucca Mountain rail corridor, mining
5 corridor was still on the books, which pretty well
6 knocked that out at that time.

7 MR. PAPPALARDO: You couldn't work around
8 the old corridor?

9 MR. SELEY: We had oil and gas leases on
10 the south half, geothermal leases on the northern
11 part.

12 MR. PAPPALARDO: If the geothermal leases
13 worked in conjunction with the solar, it could be a
14 combination?

15 MR. SELEY: They could be, yes. The
16 mining claims, because the mining claims or
17 geothermal lease or oil and gas leases do convey a
18 property right during the time you hold those. It
19 could be sold, traded. So it can be programmatic as
20 far as getting the right-of-way, which leads to two
21 rights-of-ways, subject to values and different
22 rights. So there could be conflicts in the Gold
23 Point project there.

24 MR. PAPPALARDO: I didn't realize that
25 there were so many mining claims across the salt

00024

1 marsh. I hadn't studied that area. Another area
2 that we were looking at in the range, I talked to a
3 couple of gentlemen from the range, and of course,
4 they are worried about the radar impacts from wind
5 turbines and then, of course, the mirrors when
6 they're doing the training, but the outlying areas,
7 a geothermal, a combination project might work in
8 that area that if that doesn't interfere with the
9 range.

10 MR. SELEY: Again, the entire valley
11 bottom is pretty well staked up with mining claims.

12 MR. PAPPALARDO: That's why the area was
13 left out? So what about the range we first talked
14 about? Is that staked up a lot? I'm not aware of
15 that being, so.

16 MR. SELEY: Off the top of my head,
17 neither Alan or myself --

18 MR. PAPPALARDO: And the transmission
19 corridor runs through twice. I think that's why one
20 was an alternate that is no longer being considered.

21 MR. SELEY: Right.

22 MR. PAPPALARDO: It runs through it and
23 it's flat in the center of it. I mean, that might
24 be a place to consider relocating the one you have
25 at Gold Point, put it up in the energy park and it

00025

1 should eliminate that problem and be closer to the
2 poles to the transmission line. That might be
3 something to consider.

4 MR. SELEY: It's still in the same water
5 basin. That area runs into conflicts with wildlife.

6 MR. PAPPALARDO: Is there that much
7 wildlife out there?

8 MR. SELEY: Well, as we know it in
9 Esmeralda County and a lot of the Nevada desert, the
10 most quality for animals is desirable --

11 MR. PAPPALARDO: Up in the mountains?

12 MR. SELEY: Well, they've got to have a
13 winter habitat.

14 MR. PAPPALARDO: I'm not familiar with it.

15 MR. SELEY: It comes down to the winter
16 habitat. I'm not saying that couldn't work, but
17 it's something that would have to be clearly
18 analyzed.

19 MS. RESSEGUIE: What I was going to say,
20 this is a really good discussion, but in the solar
21 PEIS as we're working on it right now, we're not
22 able to add new areas and do a new analysis for this
23 particular project.

24 MR. PAPPALARDO: No.

25 MS. RESSEGUIE: But future range plan

00026

1 amendments can certainly consider energy areas, and
2 probably will.

3 MR. SELEY: That's correct. That's one of
4 the parts of the current land use plan. We're going
5 through a revision because this is something that
6 almost all of the existing land use plans in Nevada
7 put together, this is not even a part of.

8 MR. PAPPALARDO: So new locations are not
9 really being considered in this Programmatic EIS?

10 MS. RESSEGUIE: Right, because adding a
11 new location at this point would take significant
12 additional analysis, and there is a schedule that
13 we're trying to adhere to. One of the points Jane
14 just made, just so it's clear, see if I get this
15 right, is that we are looking at these proposed
16 zones, we've done a lot of analysis, but the
17 decision has not been made about whether to carry
18 forward any of the zones or any of the zones in
19 their entirety. That's what we're doing here now.

20 The record of decision could actually come
21 out and say we are not going to designate this area
22 as a zone, but that will be -- the decisions haven't
23 been made, but we aren't adding new prospective
24 zones to this project. So it's a matter of going
25 with the ones we have, reducing them or eliminating.

00027

1 MR. PAPPALARDO: Is it possible to shift a
2 zone possibly on the map a little bit? Would that
3 maybe be considered?

4 MS. RESSEGUIE: I don't think we can
5 include any additional land at this point because it
6 would require additional analysis. Kind of like
7 starting over. Eric?

8 MR. PETLOCK: Yeah. I was wondering if
9 you could clarify something on what you were just
10 saying here. So you're saying at this point in time
11 no new additional zones would be added within this
12 PEIS?

13 MS. RESSEGUIE: Right.

14 MR. PETLOCK: That no additional lands
15 could be added. So anything, if it hasn't already
16 been identified is a potential zone, could not be
17 added?

18 MS. RESSEGUIE: Carried forward as a zone
19 in this document.

20 MR. PETLOCK: Okay. What about could the
21 zones that have already been identified, can they be
22 modified or shrunk?

23 MS. RESSEGUIE: Yes. They very much can
24 be shrunk --

25 MR. PETLOCK: Okay.

00028

1 MS. RESSEGUIE: -- to take out, maybe
2 there's a wildlife corridor, maybe there's a wash,
3 maybe there's something going on that isn't
4 appropriate for solar energy development.
5 Definitely, we can take those areas and shrink them.
6 We just don't have the capacity to expand them. But
7 one of the things I thought you were going to ask me
8 is we are looking at incorporating as part of our
9 program a process for identifying additional zones
10 in the future.

11 MR. PETLOCK: Yeah, that's in the
12 document.

13 MS. RESSEGUIE: Yes.

14 MR. PETLOCK: But in terms of as of now,
15 though, for example, the example that these folks
16 gave of a particular location near their community
17 that they would say we're not --

18 MS. RESSEGUIE: Crazy about, yeah.

19 MR. PETLOCK: So that or, for example,
20 winter range scenarios, the Department of Wildlife
21 says, "Hey, this is a winter range here," those
22 boundaries can be modified?

23 MS. RESSEGUIE: Right, and that's exactly
24 the kind of comments we're looking at. Just the
25 very things that you mentioned are exactly what

00029

1 these meetings are about, to try to get people to
2 come forward to tell us what we don't know.

3 MS. JOHNSON: Okay. Also, Esmeralda
4 County signed in 2009 a memorandum of understanding
5 with BLM, Department of Interior, whoever else,
6 regarding this solar project thing. Why are we not
7 being kept in the loop? Because I don't believe we
8 are as far as what's going on, because this was two
9 years ago. You have not really been coming to the
10 Board of Commissioners or really, I don't think,
11 keeping track of keeping us in the loop of what is
12 going on with this.

13 MS. RESSEGUIE: You are absolutely right.
14 There is a memorandum of understanding that BLM
15 Nevada and Esmeralda County entered into.

16 MS. JOHNSON: That's right.

17 MS. RESSEGUIE: So that Esmeralda County
18 could be a cooperating agency.

19 MS. JOHNSON: That's right.

20 MS. RESSEGUIE: We have tried to keep the
21 County aware of various webcast meetings, draft
22 documents, but I don't think they've been able to --
23 I don't know if the communication line wasn't good
24 or if they haven't had the capacity to participate.
25 I'm not sure what the situation is there.

00030

1 MR. PAPPALARDO: So what you were saying
2 earlier, so outside of this document a company still
3 could put in --

4 MS. RESSEGUIE: An application.

5 MR. PAPPALARDO: -- an application for
6 other locations outside of these areas, but these
7 are the preferred locations for the site?

8 MS. RESSEGUIE: These are the ones we were
9 trying to hone in on where we would prioritize so
10 everyone would have a better understanding of where
11 solar was going and there wouldn't be so much
12 confusion and opposition because we would be
13 directing it to places that we've all talked about,
14 agreed to and identified as being appropriate.

15 MR. PAPPALARDO: That doesn't preclude a
16 company for asking for a location that's not in
17 these locations?

18 MS. RESSEGUIE: In our preferred
19 alternative it does not preclude a company from
20 coming to BLM and saying, "We think this is a really
21 good spot. What do you think?" And then we would
22 react to it.

23 MR. SELEY: That would be something that
24 could be addressed in the land use plan.

25 MR. PAPPALARDO: Right.

00031

1 MR. SELEY: If you go through we may
2 identify right-of-way avoidance areas for these
3 types to project be identified, criteria such as
4 height or what have you. But as Linda said, they're
5 free to apply anywhere outside the wilderness, no
6 right-of-way avoidance. We have to analyze each
7 project on its merits.

8 MR. JOHNSON: The problem with that
9 process, in the, just this past year I've been to a
10 couple of BLM projects, for instance, in Washington.
11 Their same developers are proposing projects in
12 Lincoln County, people. If you don't have these
13 zones identified and constraints and boundaries of
14 those zones drawn properly in the first place, just
15 like these wind projects, they come through and
16 poo-poo you. That really doesn't matter, okay? And
17 you really don't count, okay? That's the emphasis
18 from these developers. We want to put it here and,
19 at that point the tendency is to cram it down your
20 throat.

21 MS. JOHNSON: Exactly.

22 MR. JOHNSON: And that is why these bills
23 need to be, zones need to be vetted through a very
24 public process, not after the Draft EIS is already
25 written, but to gain this input before that analysis

00032

1 is ever started.

2 MS. RESSEGUIE: Well, we did have --

3 MS. JOHNSON: It's already finished now.

4 MR. PAPPALARDO: That's the problem I'm

5 having now, is we can't look at alternative zones.

6 We are out of that loop. We can only look at what

7 you guys have already put on the map. I agree with

8 what he's saying. That we need to be in this ahead

9 of that and help you guys identify some zones. That

10 we now have a problem with instead of just saying

11 this is the only areas we can look at now because

12 you have identified the zones.

13 MR. JOHNSON: Your deadlines, I presume,

14 have been dictated from either the head of BLM,

15 Secretary of the Interior, or maybe higher.

16 MS. RESSEGUIE: You would be right about

17 one of those.

18 MR. JOHNSON: One of the three. This

19 reminds me of the Elko County Forest Service Travel

20 Management Plan, okay, in that they held a couple

21 public scoping meetings and said, "Our schedule is

22 we're going to have this done by June and our people

23 are going to do it and we're going to supply the

24 citizens with what roads we're going to close and

25 what roads we're going to leave open." And we look

00033

1 at their staff and in Elko County the longest guy's
2 been there for two years. And he doesn't know
3 (inaudible) bridge, he doesn't know these streets.
4 He hasn't been on these roads. How is he going to
5 do it? He's going to do it with his computer with
6 his magic GIS layer.

7 And when the citizens jumped up and down
8 and yelled and screamed, we finally had to get our
9 congressional delegation to come downstairs to the
10 head of the Forest Service going, "Elko County needs
11 more time." And guess what? We got more time.

12 That's, this process of all of these
13 comments having to be submitted by March 15, 17,
14 whatever, I'm just talking about Tom here with NDOW,
15 he didn't know about half of the Gold Point zones,
16 let alone comments, let alone we don't know if the
17 biologists at NDOW have the time to give their
18 adequate input to you to where you can do this.

19 MS. RESSEGUIE: You know, that's a good
20 point because NDOW has a cooperating agency that we
21 use similar to Esmeralda County, but I know that,
22 and I can't think of the guy's name. Brad.

23 MR. JOHNSON: Steve, yeah, I was going to
24 say Steve Siegel is the head of habitat. I just
25 talked to him.

00034

1 MS. RESSEGUIE: Anyway, I know there were
2 issues and we didn't end up getting good
3 participation from them on the administrative draft,
4 and I think it was because they didn't have time to
5 address it. So I recognize that. I don't know
6 about how it -- are you a local?

7 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, I'm a local. I'm from
8 Tonopah. Brad Hartbroc (sic) is very concerned with
9 Clark County and everything that's further north.

10 MS. RESSEGUIE: But that is the gentleman
11 that we have interacted with.

12 Sandra?

13 MS. JOHNSON: Yeah. I want to make a
14 comment. It's reminiscent of when Harry Reid tried
15 to shove wilderness down Esmeralda County's throat
16 and we told him no. He wanted to take and designate
17 wilderness all over this county. We're 97 percent
18 BLM managed as it is. How much more does he want?
19 This is what it reminds me of. We were not kept in
20 the loop. We were not given the opportunity to make
21 comments on this until the last minute. And that's
22 not right. I mean, we live here. We like our
23 landscape the way it is. We don't need all this
24 other crap. It needs to be hidden.

25 I've gone into California and seen all

00035

1 of the mess that they made down there with those
2 stupid windmills and the solar projects and stuff
3 and it's unsightly. We don't need that in our area.
4 We've got little as it is. Leave us our landscapes.

5 MR. PAPPALARDO: If I could add, the solar
6 project would completely take away from the ghost
7 town of Gold Point and the scenery there. They talk
8 about a scenic resource. That's a scenic resource
9 that needs to be reserved. I'd really like to see
10 that zone eliminated. If it can't be shifted or
11 moved, just eliminated and talk to other companies
12 to apply for other areas. I would like to see that
13 area eliminated.

14 MS. RESSEGUIE: Eric?

15 MR. PETLOCK: I wanted to hear a little
16 bit more about the, just a little bit of what is
17 designated as a preferred alternative. Because if I
18 understand correctly, what is designated to be
19 zones, and those in simple layman's terms would be
20 kind of a fast-track area, if a developer wanted to
21 come in with an EAS as opposed to a full-blown EIS.
22 However, if they decided to do it someplace outside
23 of the zone, they're perfectly entitled to submit an
24 application and go through the EIS process and build
25 outside of the zone; is that correct?

00036

1 MS. RESSEGUIE: Well, we just issued some
2 new policies this past week, which obviously, unless
3 you are following day-to-day what's happening with
4 the Department of Interior you wouldn't know about
5 it, but you're basically correct. The idea is for
6 projects in areas that are designated zones to be
7 more certain and move faster through the NEPA and
8 permitting process. That's the whole idea of
9 designating zones. And that's the incentive of
10 industry to go there. And this is a more certain,
11 less costly, faster process for you. But under the
12 preferred alternative we would still allow companies
13 to approach us in the light blue area with project
14 ideas.

15 The new policy that we came out with on
16 February 7th or 8th is that we are now requiring
17 companies to have at least two or three application
18 meetings with us. Tom, I don't even know if that
19 stuff has hit your desk. But we will not take an
20 application from a company until we have sat down
21 with them two times and looked at their proposal,
22 what resources would be affected, met with other
23 federal and state agencies such as NDOW and Fish and
24 Wildlife Service, National Park Service, in some
25 cases probably Forest Service, in some cases

00037

1 depending where the proposed project is sited. Sort
2 of get the feel for, yes, it's in an area that we
3 have said we would consider application, but is it a
4 good area or is it a, are there significant resource
5 conflicts. And the way the policy is designed is
6 that BLM has the authority to say don't even bother
7 to file an application. If you do file an
8 application in this area, we're going to deny it
9 because we've all sat down, looked at it and it's
10 not a good site.

11 MR. PETLOCK: So that leads to the last
12 part of my question. Under the other alternative,
13 that's not the preferred alternative at this time?

14 MS. RESSEGUIE: Zones-only.

15 MR. PETLOCK: Zones-only. It would be
16 essentially that if a developer came along and said,
17 "We want to build something outside of this zone,"
18 that the BLM is going to say don't bother submitting
19 an application because we're not looking at it.

20 MS. RESSEGUIE: Because our land use plans
21 say that this is a no-go area for solar.

22 MR. PETLOCK: Am I understanding that
23 correctly, under the second action alternative, the
24 zones-only approach, that if you're not in the zone,
25 don't bother submitting an application because it

00038

1 wouldn't even be considered?

2 MS. RESSEGUIE: Right. We would reject
3 it, right, inconsistent with the land use plans as
4 we've amended them for the solar EIS.

5 MR. PETLOCK: Okay.

6 MS. JOHNSON: I have a quick question.
7 How is this going to benefit Esmeralda County? Like
8 monetarily, are we really going to get anything from
9 this?

10 MS. RESSEGUIE: There's no revenue sharing
11 for local governments, unlike geothermal you might
12 be familiar with.

13 MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

14 MS. RESSEGUIE: Oil and gas leases there's
15 revenue sharings, but these are rights-of-ways. All
16 of the money that the company pays to us for land
17 rents and all the fees that they pay us go to the
18 Treasury. That's the way the law is written and we
19 don't have any discretion in that.

20 MR. PAPPALARDO: If it takes 50 people to
21 run the facility, they presumably would live locally
22 and spend locally, so.

23 MS. RESSEGUIE: Right.

24 MR. SELEY: The other agency aspect of
25 that is even though the government signed tax

00039

1 abatements last year, any real improvements, the
2 County would be taxed on. I know how it works.

3 MR. PAPPALARDO: They're paying us.

4 MR. SELEY: That's right.

5 MS. RESSEGUIE: That's different in
6 California, I think. I don't know. Some people
7 were telling me that in California the law that they
8 passed was the local government could not tax the
9 infrastructure.

10 MR. SELEY: That's correct. California
11 is very upset because there are private lands there
12 that are not attractive because of the law
13 California passed.

14 MS. RESSEGUIE: Okay. Larry?

15 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah. I wanted to
16 mention that last fall along those lines, bills were
17 simultaneously introduced in the House of
18 Representatives and Senate using Lincoln County as
19 the model. And I think that there are western
20 representatives that have gone to that language and
21 said you should make this a westwide, or nation-wide
22 bill. And it said that instead of granting
23 rights-of-way, these actually would be subject to
24 (inaudible), and that the lease dollars, a certain
25 percentage would be returned to local economy, a

00040

1 certain percentage would be to offset mitigating
2 wildlife habitat because of the project, and I think
3 certain percentage to you.

4 MS. RESSEGUIE: Right. And I think there
5 were multiple bills with different prescriptions,
6 but yeah, there were.

7 MR. JOHNSON: And I spoke with Reid's
8 staff on the way down today trying, and is their
9 plan to --

10 MS. RESSEGUIE: Reintroduce.

11 MR. JOHNSON: -- reintroduce that and get
12 a coalition westward of senators and
13 representatives. So that would be a potential
14 understanding for source to the local government.

15 MR. PAPPALARDO: That would be very
16 helpful, at least to us.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Do you guys have a
18 list of the criteria you use to determine if there's
19 like a no-go part in there that's says you
20 absolutely can't do that? Do you have a list of
21 criteria for that?

22 MR. PETLOCK: It's in the executive
23 summary of the NEPA.

24 MS. RESSEGUIE: Right. There's a table
25 that lists all the categories. So there's like 25

00041

1 different land categories that are excluded from the
2 preferred alternative. So that's what you are
3 looking for, is that list?

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, it's a list
5 to look at considering the, for Tribal issues, stuff
6 like that I would like to know.

7 MS. RESSEGUIE: And I think Jim is going
8 to show you the list. We have at least one copy of
9 the executive summary, so he'll give you the list to
10 take a look at. Eric?

11 MR. PETLOCK: One more comment on your,
12 you mentioned the new policy that was just adopted a
13 week ago or something. It was interesting because
14 you mentioned in that policy it talks about consult
15 with other State and Federal agencies, but you
16 didn't say anything about coming in and consulting
17 with local government or local entities. Is that,
18 is there any language in that?

19 MS. RESSEGUIE: County jurisdictions, I
20 think that there's, it's like a list of entities
21 that should be consulted, and I think that counties
22 are one of those in that document. Those
23 instruction memos are available through BLM's
24 website.

25 MR. PETLOCK: Okay.

00042

1 MS. RESSEGUIE: If you're familiar with
2 BLM's website, there's kind of text in the middle
3 that talks about current sort of events. So you
4 might want to take a look at those.

5 MR. PETLOCK: I would just make a comment
6 that that is a bad example of where it seems that
7 local input is sort of at the bottom of the list of
8 priorities of consultations as opposed to at the
9 very top of the list is that this is where you go to
10 start. This is where you get the kind of
11 information that you need to then work your way down
12 through all of this other.

13 MS. RESSEGUIE: Right. And there other,
14 my understanding was there was some discussion about
15 that because the NEPA process has the public built
16 into it so that we have public scoping meetings and
17 we have public meetings about the draft and, you
18 know.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Were those meetings
20 in Esmeralda County?

21 MS. RESSEGUIE: We had one scoping meeting
22 and it was in Las Vegas.

23 MR. PAPPALARDO: That's not Esmeralda
24 County.

25 MS. RESSEGUIE: No, I realize that. I'm

00043

1 trying to address Eric's question. There's mixed
2 results in letting companies have public meetings
3 right from the get-go, because it may be something
4 that does not, isn't going to progress, you know,
5 into the NEPA stage. And so one of the things that
6 you might do to help us with improving our process,
7 Eric, is if you could hone right in on that issue
8 and say I've looked at these new memos and it seems
9 to me that if the BLM is going to develop a new
10 process, that they need to move the public
11 participation up, you know, even from what's in that
12 new memo. That would be helpful.

13 MR. PETLOCK: Definitely make a comment on
14 the written comment on the website?

15 MS. RESSEGUIE: Yeah, through the website.
16 Yeah, because we have just tried to improve the
17 process, sort of ratchet up the requirements. But
18 you're pointing out what might be a flaw in this,
19 and I think that commenting through the Draft PEIS
20 is appropriate because we're trying to design this
21 new program.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We have some sort
23 of deadline for comments?

24 MS. RESSEGUIE: March 17th is the comment
25 deadline, yes, so almost exactly a month.

00044

1 MR. SELEY: I think the one important
2 thing to bring out, at least for the Tonopah office,
3 our standard operating procedure, if we have someone
4 come in, we hold a pre-application meeting, and I'll
5 bring the appropriate staff and we point out what we
6 know about the area through looking at, are there
7 available water rights, yes or no? Are there
8 wildlife concerns? So that project is approved
9 through many different areas. First two sites they
10 looked at, one of my comments to them was you have
11 to have, you're going to have significant treatment
12 plans have to be done because of early man sites,
13 all the cultural resources out there, it's going to
14 take a lot of consultation with three different
15 Tribes in the area.

16 We recommend to them, I can't force them,
17 but we recommend you need to get with the County
18 Commissioners, you need to get with the town
19 manager, might want to call NDOW. We've been doing
20 this, what Linda is talking about, we have
21 formalized consistency now across the BLM, which I
22 think is a good thing. We tried to take the high
23 road here to get everybody involved from the ground
24 up and there's a lot of issues, particularly
25 military employers till they stop the program in the

00045

1 north end. Still want to make it employers.

2 MR. PAPPALARDO: Right.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just a comment. I

4 looked for some wind power on Tonopah. We have a

5 lot of wind there. Most of that is restricted land.

6 I got a plan from BLM, six areas from test site.

7 They're not going to use it.

8 MS. RESSEGUIE: They don't much like

9 towers.

10 MR. SELEY: The other thing, wind towers,

11 our RECO project manager and field officer

12 stationed down here in the district, we've got a

13 standing MOU with Esmeralda County formally with the

14 process put in place. And the same thing with Nye

15 County. And it's set up with sharing of GIS layers.

16 I'm pretty sure some of the other things. So we've

17 really tried to bring from the ground up on a lots

18 of the stuff. There's some areas we brought up,

19 probably not wise, problems on other technologies

20 out there.

21 MS. RESSEGUIE: Richard, did you have

22 something?

23 MR. ARNOLD: Can I make an addendum to my

24 statement?

25 MS. RESSEGUIE: Sure.

00046

1 MR. ARNOLD: Make sure it gets on the
2 record. I'll speak in the microphone to make it
3 easier. Richard Arnold, an addendum to my previous
4 comments. First of all, one is a question. You had
5 mentioned that this process will be finalized in the
6 fall of 2011.

7 MS. RESSEGUIE: That is the goal.

8 MR. ARNOLD: That is the goal. What is
9 the anticipated goal for the ROD, the Record of
10 Decision?

11 MS. RESSEGUIE: Shortly thereafter, within
12 a month or two, following completion of the PEIS.

13 MR. ARNOLD: Okay. Thank you. One of the
14 things the tribes have been confused on with this
15 project is that the tribes have very good working
16 relationship with the local BLM office and so we
17 interface a lot with them down in Amargosa Valley.
18 For example, there's a Pahrump field office that is
19 over Pahrump and Amargosa Valley. There's been
20 other proponents with solar energy projects. And so
21 in those cases we talked to the home office. And
22 for purposes of this project, we don't talk to them,
23 we have to talk to the BLM headquarters and submit
24 our things. So it's a very convoluted process that
25 causes a lot of concern in sharing information.

00047

1 The second thing I think Tom raised a
2 really good point about some of the cultural
3 resources and the early man sites, and things that
4 are out there. Unfortunately, all the documentation
5 that's out there is only based upon information that
6 was selected for projects where there may have been
7 potential ground-disturbing activities. There are
8 studies out there that they've made, this is what we
9 have. To the places that there haven't been any
10 studies, there is no documentation. So that really
11 creates a big void in the process of understanding
12 how in light of the site-certain locations, it's
13 really analogous to what you're hearing from a lot
14 of the communities here, if you're not talking to
15 people then you are never going to know. You just,
16 arbitrarily maybe figure on a plan based upon
17 best-guess information that you may have readily
18 available, but again, you may be missing some highly
19 significant areas.

20 The other thing I wanted to mention for
21 purposes of PEIS is obviously, you heard it here and
22 I did mention that I was concerned with the visual
23 resources, because if there is going to be a lot of
24 concerns there about culturally that overlap
25 individual resources and the visual impact that

00048

1 you're going to have from having solar projects.

2 With the animal habitat that was discussed
3 earlier, cultural relief for us, we share the same
4 sentiments about migration and things with animals,
5 where they go and migrate. We even have birthing
6 areas on the Tonopah testing range that were
7 identified by Tribal people that historically were
8 known and culturally were known birthing areas for
9 places that a lot of the wildlife people didn't know
10 at that time. So they started monitoring the
11 information based upon some of the Tribal
12 information. So we're hoping that that will again,
13 be considered. But moreover, with the animal
14 habitats that we looked at the animals and what
15 those mean to us culturally.

16 So for example, you have bighorn sheep
17 migration areas. Well, bighorn sheep for us, were a
18 feature of songs and stories, all the of the common
19 knowledge that we needed. So when you're impacting
20 their resources, or the desert tortoise has a high
21 cultural significance, those kind of animals, unless
22 you have, I guess a foundation for the cultural
23 information, again that wouldn't be the emphasis.

24 One of the things I wanted to point out is
25 wildlife, with all due respect, understand the

00049

1 concerns of the local community, the county, you
2 know, see them as cooperating agencies. The
3 counties technically don't have jurisdiction over
4 the tribes, but you don't see the tribes as being
5 cooperating agencies. And so then you're having
6 counties, basically speak on behalf of the tribes
7 and saying what we think is good for the county, even
8 though you may have a reservation within that
9 county. So again, another flaw.

10 The last thing I wanted to share a little
11 insight with, we were working on, I had actually
12 coordinating tribe people working on a solar EIS and
13 it had to do with the cultural perspective of taking
14 the solar energy. And again, this isn't culturally
15 founded and based, but this gives you kind of an
16 understanding of how broad this is. It's more than
17 just taking the sun and converting it into
18 electricity and putting it out there. Because for
19 us culturally, they say we were in meetings with
20 elders and interviewed them talking about how
21 once -- the sun is like a battery. And it has so
22 much power. And once you start draining that power,
23 it can't replenish itself. That's the first
24 problem. The second problem is you're taking it
25 artificially and you're harnessing it in these

00050

1 little photovoltaic panels and the other types of
2 panels, and so now it's being transmitted and
3 converted into energy, artificial energy.

4 Secondly, then it's also going into --
5 across the landscape which affects the environment.
6 It affects weather, it affects the balance of
7 things. You know, it was a very deep philosophical
8 cultural conversation that we had with these people,
9 but again it shows you the breadth of this problem.

10 Again, none of this would ever be
11 recorded, understood or considered if you didn't
12 have the Tribal people involved in the process of
13 sharing our points of view, echoing that with
14 everything you are hearing from the counties, the
15 community and the people that work within the state
16 here. Everything that is so important to us, we
17 need to somehow have a voice. And then when we
18 thought it was the local offices. We thought we had
19 the same local as you guys used and the same one
20 that's on the PEIS, but no, you can't talk to us.
21 You've got to go to them. So sometimes we were
22 finding that there's a little bit of a disconnect
23 between the local offices and the Federal offices,
24 sometimes in the communication, sometimes in the
25 understanding of a person and understanding of the

00051

1 influence over the local areas. And I know that
2 it's being shared locally with the BLM office, even
3 though it's a BLM initiative, and people are saying
4 locally in the BLM office, why are they telling us
5 what we don't even know. Here we have a
6 relationship with the tribes and the communities or
7 whatever, and now this is another process we have
8 thrown in. Anyway, end of comments. Thank you.

9 MR. PAPPALARDO: I have a question again.
10 For this document and to preferred locations what
11 was the end date on identifying locations, the final
12 end date for identifying whether it could be on the
13 map? When was that date?

14 MS. RESSEGUIE: That work was done in the
15 spring of 2009.

16 MR. SELEY: 2010, I believe.

17 MS. RESSEGUIE: 2009 for the solar energy
18 study areas and we published a notice of the
19 addition of the study areas to the solar energy PEIS
20 on June 30th, 2009. And then we had a comment
21 period that went through September 15th.

22 MR. PAPPALARDO: Tom, do you know if you
23 worked with the Esmeralda County Commissioners
24 office, or?

25 MR. SELEY: We were open. No, I have

00052

1 been completely open about that. I did communicate
2 with the commissioners prior.

3 MR. PAPPALARDO: Right.

4 MR. SELEY: I did go through avenues on
5 what the siting criteria was. I hit most of it. I
6 may have missed one or two tonight.

7 MS. RESSEGUIE: But the process came up
8 very quickly and local offices were asked to take
9 their best shot at it very quickly because there was
10 an opportunity to do it at that point in time and it
11 was like, get up, get going or get left behind, so.
12 I just want you to know that Tom didn't have much
13 time to react.

14 MR. PAPPALARDO: Tom would be the one
15 Goldfield would work with. I'm just starting to
16 work with you guys now more than ever. I wasn't in
17 the driver's seat back in April and June of '09,
18 but, so. I was just curious to know what the
19 timetable was. I believe it was April or June of
20 '09 and June of '09.

21 MS. RESSEGUIE: I think we started talking
22 about it in the February, March time frame, got
23 nominations from the State March, April, and then
24 put it together and put it out for public comment
25 the very end of June. Like the last day of June.

00053

1 MR. PAPPALARDO: That was the beginning of
2 our land use coming together.

3 MR. SELEY: Yes, that was the beginning of
4 that process.

5 MS. RESSEGUIE: Eric, do you have another
6 question?

7 MR. PETLOCK: I think I got it.

8 MS. RESSEGUIE: It's getting late.
9 Anybody else have anything they want to talk about?

10 MR. ROBERTS: I have a quick question.
11 Can we go back to the megawatts real quick? A
12 megawatt, so we can understand a megawatt, how many
13 homes can a megawatt supply on average for?

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Great question.
15 Without calculating, probably 250 to 260 homes per
16 megawatt. And if we develop the entire 24,000 it's
17 43 million homes.

18 MR. ROBERTS: Right. So nine acres, it's
19 nine acres per megawatt, right?

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

21 MR. ROBERTS: Over about a year, is that a
22 year?

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: They run for 30
24 years.

25 MR. ROBERTS: No, no, no. Nine acres

00054

1 makes a megawatt. In what length of time does it
2 supply 225 homes?

3 MR. PETLOCK: I think I can help you with
4 that. So a megawatt, you turn on the switch, that's
5 how much is coming out at that particular time. If
6 that runs at that rate for an hour, that's a
7 megawatt hour. What he's saying is when it's the
8 fully built-out capacity, is 24,000 megawatts. When
9 you turn that switch on, theoretically, 24,000
10 megawatts is coming out, whether it's for one minute
11 or one hour. And what he's saying is that
12 approximately 30 percent of the time, that's what is
13 coming out. And with solar especially, the sun goes
14 up, the sun goes down. So 30 percent of the time
15 during that year, and that is going to go up in the
16 morning and go down in the afternoon.

17 While we were here I just looked on the
18 Internet, so Hoover Dam produces their rate of
19 capacity is 2,080 megawatts.

20 MR. ROBERTS: Per?

21 MR. PETLOCK: Again, from the moment they
22 turn the turbines on on the dam, turn everything on,
23 and running at full capacity, there's 2,080
24 megawatts in terms of electricity coming out,
25 whether it runs for an hour or day, or, if it runs

00055

1 for an hour, that's a megawatt hour. And their
2 annual output is 4.2 billion kilowatts, or 42
3 million megawatts, right? And under this solar
4 regime, 24,000 megawatts times, you know, one year
5 at a third, .33 is a third, comes out to about
6 69 million megawatts.

7 So the difference between Hoover Dam when
8 it's running at full capacity and this, when it's,
9 theoretically is running at full capacity, is about
10 ten times. So this is about ten times, a little
11 more than ten times what Hoover Dam puts out if you
12 compare them.

13 MR. ROBERTS: So it all averages.

14 MR. PETLOCK: So this is about ten times
15 Hoover Dam's capacity, the difference being Hoover
16 Dam can turn the switch on in the middle of the
17 night, or anytime, whereas this is --

18 MR. ROBERTS: There's a lot more acreage
19 being burned up in the mountain, that's the water
20 behind Hoover Dam.

21 MS. RESSEGUIE: Yes.

22 MR. PETLOCK: That I don't know. Good
23 question.

24 MS. RESSEGUIE: What's the area of, yes.
25 What's the area of Hoover Dam?

00056

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You get to know the
2 current technologies, there's something called solar
3 reserves. They use salts, so it can operate 24
4 hours.

5 MR. PAPPALARDO: The mirrors reflect onto
6 the heat during the day.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, yes. It's a
8 reserve tank. It can operate 24 hours,
9 theoretically. Probably not.

10 MS. RESSEGUIE: Folks, Sandra, do you have
11 one more comment?

12 MS. JOHNSON: Yes. Who is actually going
13 to benefit, I mean, all the power is going to be
14 shipped out elsewhere. We're really not going to
15 benefit in the County; is that correct?

16 MS. RESSEGUIE: Let me ask you. Do you
17 know where Solar Reserves' power is going?

18 MR. SELEY: Solar Reserves power bought by
19 NV Energy or Sierra Pacific Company, so small
20 amounts will be shipped to the north part of the
21 state.

22 MS. RESSEGUIE: It just depends on who,
23 the company gets to buy the power, where it goes.
24 So it could be consumed locally or it could be
25 shipped, you know, exported.

00057

1 One of the things, just for the benefit of
2 the court reporter, is I'm going to formally adjourn
3 the meeting now and we can continue to talk and
4 visit, but we'll do it offline. Again, thank you
5 all for coming.

6 (Whereupon, proceedings were concluded at 9:00
7 p.m.)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

00058

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 16th
9 day of February, 2011; that my stenotype notes were
10 later transcribed into type-writing under my
11 direction, and the foregoing 57 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