

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

SUPPLEMENT TO DRAFT SOLAR ENERGY  
PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (PEIS)\*



PUBLIC MEETINGS (NV, AZ, CA)  
PRESENTED BY THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND THE  
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY  
NOV-DEC 2011 RENEWABLE ENERGY

Reported by:  
Kimberly M. Lowe  
CCR 849  
Sarnoff Court Reporters

---

\* This transcript has been modified by Argonne National Laboratory to correct any obvious grammatical and transcription errors.

A P P E A R A N C E S

MARK SPENCER

Bureau of Land Management

SHANNON STEWART

Bureau of Land Management

JENNIFER DECESARO

U.S. Department of Energy

HEIDI HARTMANN

Argonne National Laboratory

C O N T E N T S

PUBLIC COMMENTS:	PAGE
Ms. Brittany Sandler (on behalf of Senator Dean Heller) .....	2
Mr. Alex Daue .....	4
Mr. Kevin Emory .....	7
Mr. Rob Mrowka .....	12
Ms. Judy Bandorf .....	16
Mr. James Moore .....	18
Mr. Gary Vesperman .....	24
Mr. George T. Rowe .....	27
Ms. Connie Simkins .....	28
Ms. Jane Feldman .....	31
Mr. John Hiatt .....	34
Ms. Aleta Joan Dupree .....	38
Ms. Lynn Davis .....	41
Ms. Laura Cunningham .....	42
Mr. Richard Arnold .....	44
Mr. Jeremy Drew .....	51
Mr. Don Reid .....	52

1 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 2011

2 7:00 P.M. - 8:51 P.M.

3 -oOo-

4

5

6 SPEAKER: Brittany Sandler, on behalf of Senator Dean Heller.

7 Good afternoon. As mentioned, my name is

8 Brittany Sandler, and I'm here this evening on

9 behalf of Senator Dean Heller who has asked that

10 I share the following statement with everyone,

11 specifically addressed to Shannon with the BLM

12 and Jennifer with the Department of Energy.

13 Thank you for holding this meeting today

14 to discuss the Supplement to the Draft Solar

15 Energy Development Programmatic Environmental

16 Impact Statement, PEIS.

17 As a strong supporter of renewable

18 energy development, it's my hope that this PEIS

19 creates much needed jobs in Nevada and throughout

20 the Southwest.

21 As a member of the Senate Energy and

22 Natural Resources Committee, I'm on the frontline

23 for the energy issues in Congress. I understand

24 that, in order to realize the full potential of

25 clean, renewable energy, the federal government

1 has to both facilitate development and promote  
2 policies that improve our economic environment.

3 I have supported a renewable energy  
4 portfolio and am proud of the progress that Nevada  
5 has made towards achieving our state renewable  
6 energy standards. I support all forms of  
7 responsible energy development in order to  
8 provide the necessary economic and national  
9 security Americans deserve. Our country needs an  
10 energy policy that is smart, clean, and reliable.  
11 Nevada is an important part of our nation's clean  
12 energy future, and access to appropriate federal  
13 land for solar development in our state will help  
14 us move responsibly toward that future.

15 Because nearly 85 percent of Nevada is  
16 federal land, I have made it a priority to make  
17 federal land available for those interested in  
18 responsibly harnessing our vast potential.

19 I will continue to work closely with the  
20 Bureau of Land Management, the  
21 Department of Energy, local government, the State  
22 Office of Energy, and all other stakeholders to  
23 facilitate their responsible development of  
24 renewable energy in Nevada, and the transmission  
25 lines needed to get it to the market.

1           Again, thank you for providing this  
2 forum for Nevadans to share their thoughts on the  
3 PEIS and solar energy development in Nevada.

4           Should you need any assistance gathering  
5 information that will enable you to fully grasp  
6 the opinions of the citizens I represent, please  
7 do not hesitate to contact me.

8           Signed Dean Heller, United States  
9 Senator.

10           Thank you.

11       SPEAKER: Alex Daue. Hi. My name is Alex Daue.  
12 I'm the renewable energy associate with the  
13 Wilderness Society based out of our Denver,  
14 Colorado, office. And the Wilderness Society is  
15 a national nonprofit organization that focused for  
16 75 years on protecting the wilderness and  
17 inspiring Americans to care for our wild places.

18           I want to thank the BLM and DOE for  
19 providing us the opportunity to comment tonight.

20           The Wilderness Society strongly supports  
21 responsible renewable development. We think it's  
22 a critical piece of a clean-energy future. That  
23 includes increased energy efficiency,  
24 conservation of energy, rooftop solar, and large  
25 utility-scale development.

1           And we need all of these pieces to  
2 tackle the threats of climate change, to wean  
3 ourselves off of polluting fossil fuel, and to  
4 build green jobs in the West and across the  
5 country, but these large-scale projects have real  
6 impact, and for that reason they need to be done  
7 in the right places, in the right ways.

8           And we appreciate that the BLM and DOE  
9 have prioritized environmentally responsible  
10 renewable energy development as key pieces of  
11 their mission. And we think that this PEIS  
12 process illustrates why that is important and  
13 why they've prioritized this.

14           As I've mentioned, there were over  
15 80,000 comments on the draft PEIS, and we  
16 appreciate the publication of this Supplement to  
17 address those recommendations, and we feel that  
18 many of the recommendations that were made from  
19 many different types of stakeholders have been  
20 addressed in this Supplement.

21           So we want to thank the BLM and DOE for  
22 being receptive to those recommendations. We  
23 think this is headed in a good direction. And  
24 we're going to be submitting detailed comments  
25 before the deadline that will recommend improvement,

1 but this is going in a good direction.

2 Two of the main benefits that we see  
3 from this proposed refined program alternative in  
4 the Supplement are additional certainty and  
5 additional flexibility, certainty in the form of  
6 the developers wanting to be able to make sure  
7 that good projects can get permitted and built in  
8 an efficient manner, and certainty that our most  
9 important wildland, the wildland habitat, that we  
10 protect it from development. It also provides  
11 flexibility in that it will allow the solar  
12 program to grow responsibly as we go forward.

13 With this process for new zones, the  
14 variance process takes into consideration  
15 changing needs from a renewable portfolio  
16 standard, changes in transmission access and changes  
17 in things like wildlife habitat and species  
18 areas. So this flexibility is really important  
19 as well.

20 One of the improvements we're going to  
21 recommend is additional refinement on exclusion  
22 areas, for example. One type of land that should  
23 not be open for large-scale solar development is  
24 citizen-proposed wilderness areas, and that  
25 should be added to the list of exclusion areas.



1           We also really want to make sure that  
2           these good policy elements that are being put  
3           forth as part of this program are enduring. For  
4           that reason, we're going to be supporting that  
5           these policies be put forward as amendments to  
6           the resource management plans for the affected  
7           area.

8           And you know, there's some discussion in  
9           the Supplement of some of these being put forward  
10          in instruction memoranda (IM) or other tools that  
11          aren't as durable. So we really want to see  
12          these 3 1/2 years of hard work be able to play  
13          out over the long term in a helpful way.

14          Going forward, the Wilderness Society is  
15          committed to working with agencies and the  
16          stakeholders to ensure that we develop an  
17          environmentally responsible solar energy program  
18          for our public land that both gets us the  
19          clean energy that we need and protects our most  
20          important wild land and wildlife habitat.

21          Thanks a lot.

22          SPEAKER: Kevin Emory. Okay. Thank  
23          you. My name is Kevin Emory, and I'm actually  
24          with a group called Basin and Range Watch. It's  
25          a small volunteer group. We're concerned

1 primarily about energy sprawl and the volume of  
2 land that a lot of these big projects actually  
3 need. And we're also part of a coalition of  
4 individuals in a group called "Solar Done Right,"  
5 which seeks to deal with these problems and also  
6 seeks alternatives to energy sprawl on public land.

7 First off, I'd like to say I know some  
8 people in Colorado in the San Luis Valley. They  
9 would like public meetings over there on this  
10 Supplement. Because in the draft meeting, it was  
11 packed. It was standing-room only. So you'll  
12 need to have some meetings in New Mexico, Utah,  
13 and Colorado. It will be a recommendation.

14 We appreciate that you have reduced the  
15 size of some of the zones and eliminated some of  
16 the zones, but still the preferred alternative  
17 with the variance allows the 20 million or  
18 so acres to still have business as usual to  
19 develop. As you know, there's a lot of projects  
20 already being developed under that system.

21 So giving them an additional 400,000  
22 acres with a streamlined review, it seems like a  
23 pretty big giveaway to us. That's a lot of land  
24 when you think about it, a lot of public land  
25 that there still are issues on that land.

1           Alternatives are something that need to  
2 be considered. I brought this up before. I've  
3 seen memos from the Interior Department that  
4 discourage a private land alternative, but the  
5 National Environmental Policy Act still states  
6 that alternatives outside of the jurisdiction of  
7 the lead agency do need to be considered. And  
8 those alternatives could include -- well, the  
9 Environmental Protection Agency recently  
10 identified a million and a half acres of degraded  
11 land and brownfield that you could site large  
12 utility-scale solar projects on easily, and it  
13 would serve a lot of the needs. Clean energy is  
14 a good thing. It's just about location.

15           So there's also another thing.  
16 Photovoltaics are starting to dominate large  
17 utility-scale solar. So photovoltaics are  
18 cheaper. There's not as many water issues. So  
19 the big thermal plants are kind of becoming a  
20 thing of the past.

21           So another alternative would be  
22 distributed generation. You get more bang for  
23 the buck with photovoltaics. That way you don't  
24 have a large transmission loss up to 10 to 15  
25 percent, and you can create more jobs. I mean,

1 big photovoltaic solar plants create a boom and  
2 bust where you create maybe 200 to 300  
3 construction jobs for a couple of years. Each  
4 big photovoltaic plant is going to have 10 to  
5 20 full-time jobs, and that's not really a whole  
6 lot, you know, when you think about it.

7           So the distributed generation  
8 feed-in-tariff opportunities should be considered  
9 as an alternative, and it could create more jobs.  
10 Large solar projects can hurt communities,  
11 especially ones by scenic areas like Gold Point.  
12 There's people that live up there, and they don't  
13 want a big maze of very large, tangled  
14 transmission lines and solar panels up there.  
15 It's really something to consider. The same  
16 applies in Amargosa Valley and in areas in the  
17 Riverside solar energy study zone.

18           So I'd actually like to, just if I have  
19 some more time left, enough time to talk about  
20 some of the zones. The Amargosa Valley solar  
21 zone does actually have some issues with air  
22 quality. It's really good. It's been reduced  
23 from 31,000 acres to 8,000 acres, but keep in  
24 mind 8,000 acres is still about 12 square miles.  
25 If you start moving that up -- I mean, the atomic

1 test site has a lot of radon on it. If you ask  
2 locals in Amargosa Valley, they'll tell you that  
3 the radon levels around that area, because of old  
4 atomic testing, could be double that or even  
5 triple of the national average.

6 So what happens when you start scraping  
7 that up for big massive development? I don't  
8 know the exact level of them, but it's something  
9 to look into. And to mitigate them, of course,  
10 you need water. And even big photovoltaic  
11 projects require water for dust control. To  
12 clean off the panels is going to take two to  
13 three acre-feet a year, and in areas that  
14 Amargosa Valley is over drafted by about -- I  
15 think it's 17,000 acre-feet. So that's still  
16 significant when you have construction that big.

17 The East Riverside solar study zone.  
18 Okay. The East Riverside solar study zone is  
19 big. You cut off 49,000 acres, but there's still  
20 150,000 acres of one-stop approval solar projects  
21 that you might actually designate those. The  
22 whole Blythe area has very controversial issues  
23 with the Colorado River tribes concerning  
24 cultural sites. And I noticed, even with the  
25 Supplement, you've got all of that in the solar

1 study zone. You're going to have a lot of  
2 conflicts with those people.

3 McCoy Wash has been excluded, which is a  
4 very rich microphyll habitat with really old desert  
5 ironwoods, but you only have, maybe, a half-mile  
6 corridor around it; and I have to wonder how  
7 effective that's going to be ecologically for  
8 functional ecolog -- functional ecology. Excuse  
9 me.

10 Anyway, I'll leave it at that. I don't  
11 have much time left. I've got a lot more to say  
12 about this. I'll submit it in public comment or  
13 in written comment. Thank you --- -

14 SPEAKER: My name for the record is  
15 Rob Mrowka. It's spelled M-R-O-W-K-A. And I  
16 represent the Center for Biological Diversity for  
17 whom I am an ecologist and the Nevada  
18 Conservation advocate.

19 I'd like to start off by thanking the BLM.  
20 Good call, Neal. Good job, Shannon. Thank you  
21 for listening to our comments submitted in the  
22 draft. It's very evident that you did. And we  
23 in Nevada particularly. Thanks to Alex Daue and  
24 a coalition of us working together who submitted very  
25 detailed comments on the solar energy zones that

1 were being proposed along with suggestions for  
2 changes to them, changes in mapping, changes in  
3 design features, and mitigation.

4           And while we're not perfectly happy with  
5 it, it's very clear that we're moving closer.  
6 It's something we can really get onboard and  
7 support, and we look forward to being able to  
8 comment and further voice our concern and ideas  
9 on the Supplemental.

10           The Center for Biological Diversity likes  
11 to think that almost every major environmental  
12 group in the country is very concerned about the  
13 health of our planet, specifically the health of the  
14 human population as well as the health of our  
15 natural heritage areas due to global climate  
16 change.

17           And it's only through investment and  
18 renewable energy that we're going to wean  
19 ourselves from dirty coal and dirty oil, and move  
20 towards a more sustainable environment that we're  
21 going to need to, maybe not for ourselves,  
22 certainly not for me but for our grandchildren  
23 and their children. So we put a lot of stake and  
24 effort into making this work.

25           I'm concerned a little about exclusion

1 areas. Again, like all the rest of us, I'll be  
2 submitting written comments; but I just wanted to  
3 go on record this morning -- today -- of saying that  
4 the exclusion areas are probably not all that  
5 they could be. I'm thinking of other areas like  
6 Audubon important bird areas. I'm thinking about  
7 natural heritage hotspots that the Nature  
8 Conservancy and the heritage program have  
9 identified. So we'll be going ahead and adding  
10 those to our comments.

11 As far as variances, you know, I think  
12 like Kevin and Alex, there's a lot of areas that  
13 have been identified as variance areas, and  
14 that's again of concern. We need to incentivize  
15 to the point of driving developers into the well-  
16 thought-out solar energy zones so there's less  
17 reliance on variance areas. That said, I think  
18 the Bureau of Land Management is well positioned  
19 with the release of your two instructional memos  
20 earlier this year that really create a due  
21 diligence and a process-oriented approach that  
22 will cut off some of the solar prospecting that  
23 has been going on and was leading to a great  
24 number of problems.

25 Mitigation measures, again, a lot has



1       been deferred to the final. I hope that we'll be  
2       able to have enough time between the final and  
3       the Record of Decision to really give thoughtful  
4       input into the adequacy and reliability of those  
5       mitigation measures. I'm concerned about the  
6       grandfather date of August 15, 2011, for the 25  
7       previously submitted applications in Nevada.

8               I don't think we want to continue  
9       fast-track processes that have led us to some  
10      really contentious problems and contentious  
11      issues. That grandfather date ought to be  
12      severely looked at even in view of the due  
13      diligence requirement of the IM.

14             As part of what Kevin very well said,  
15      large-scale solar is kind of a short-term fix.  
16      We need to look to increase conservation and  
17      energy efficiencies. We need to look towards  
18      private and previously disturbed lands. We need  
19      to look especially to distributed generation  
20      processes rather than relying on large-scale  
21      renewable on American public land. But again, it  
22      is a necessary part of the short-term solution.

23             In closing, I really want to express  
24      thanks to Mary Jo Rugwell and her staff and  
25      particularly Greg Helseth, who have really led

1 by example of being inclusive and being open and  
2 transparent. It's been very great to work with  
3 them.

4 I also want to recognize some of our  
5 partners, solar companies who inherited  
6 fast-track projects sites that didn't have the  
7 benefit of screening that is now being conducted  
8 both through the instructional memos as well as  
9 solar energy zones. People like Jim Woodruff and  
10 Mike Hatfield for First Solar and Don Reed from  
11 Amargosa Farm Road. They have really worked very  
12 diligently and at times very difficultly with the  
13 environmental community and other stakeholders,  
14 but they took the time. They spent the energy,  
15 and they did it. As a result, we're making  
16 lemonade out of some lemon areas. They've been  
17 willing to listen, willing to change their plans,  
18 willing to adjust boundaries. So thank you to  
19 those folks. You give me encouragement as we go  
20 forward that we're going to really do a good job  
21 out there. So thank you.

22 SPEAKER: Judy Bandorf, and I'm not with  
23 any organization. I'm a 49-year resident of  
24 Nevada, and I've always appreciated wide-open  
25 spaces, and I'm very concerned with the sprawl of

1 renewable energy.

2           Some of my issues have already been hit  
3 on, but I have heard recently of another approach  
4 to renewable energy.

5           The EPA also identified over a hundred  
6 thousand landfills that have been closed. These  
7 have to be sealed with a flexible material. In a  
8 couple of places they are putting flexible solar  
9 panels over these landfills. By this means, they  
10 are collecting solar energy. It is close to  
11 cities. It is close to existing power lines, and  
12 as a side benefit, they can also collect the  
13 methane and use that to generate even further  
14 energy.

15           I'm very concerned about the scatter of  
16 both renewable and solar and wind, the effect  
17 that it's having on our Air Force. I heard  
18 General James W. Hyatt of Nellis Air Force Base  
19 speak about two weeks ago. And he says there are  
20 tremendous challenges being met by our military  
21 as a result of these exceedingly tall, solar  
22 reflection towers in just the reflection and also  
23 the wind turbines.

24           Another problem, we run these high  
25 trans -- high-voltage transmission lines for

1 hundreds of miles and cost in excess of a million  
2 dollars per mile. The rate payers and the  
3 taxpayers of this country can't take much more.  
4 I think most of the other things have been  
5 covered, destruction of wildlife corridors,  
6 inadequate documentation of archaeological sites  
7 and trails through many of the proposed areas, and  
8 the use of our most precious resource, water  
9 during construction, dust control, washing  
10 of the panels, and for concentrated solar.

11 Thank you.

12 SPEAKER: Good afternoon. My name is  
13 James Moore. I'm the Oasis Valley project  
14 manager and Mojave Desert ecologist for the  
15 Nature Conservancy.

16 The Nature Conservancy is the world's  
17 largest conservation organization with operations  
18 in every state in over 30 countries around the  
19 globe.

20 The mission of the Conservancy is to  
21 preserve plant animals and natural communities  
22 that represent the diversity of life on earth by  
23 protecting the land and water they need to  
24 survive.

25 The goal of the Obama administration,

1 Secretary Salazar has significantly increased the  
2 generation of renewable energy on public lands,  
3 has presented our organization with an  
4 interesting challenge. This is especially true  
5 in the development of solar energy in the  
6 sun-rich desert Southwest and in particular here  
7 in Nevada.

8 To gain ground in reducing greenhouse  
9 gas emissions, Conservancy supports a significant  
10 increase in renewable electricity generation,  
11 including the siting of solar energy facilities  
12 in appropriate desert locations on both public  
13 and private land. Yet, because many Southwest  
14 desert ecosystems that we spend years protecting  
15 are also areas that have attributes that make  
16 them attractive for solar development such as  
17 large, flat intact landscapes with very high  
18 (inaudible), critically important habitats are at  
19 risk if (inaudible) cited choices are made.  
20 Conservancy has thus sought to provide site space  
21 information to these agencies and developers that  
22 will guide them to avoid areas of high ecological  
23 importance and direct renewable siting to areas  
24 of low resource conflict.

25 We think the BLM has made significant

1 strides in this respect with the Supplement to  
2 the Solar PEIS. We greatly appreciate the Bureau's  
3 willingness to modify its first draft PEIS to  
4 accommodate many of the ideas that we and many  
5 others felt were most important, significantly  
6 raising the bar for development outside of solar  
7 energy zones and reducing the overall area that  
8 is open to new application for development,  
9 eliminating or reducing some proposed solar  
10 energy zones that would have proposed significant  
11 conflicts with ecological and other values, and  
12 establishing a reasonably clear preference for  
13 and process directing future solar plant siting  
14 to those areas presenting low resource conflicts.

15           These changes represent real improvement  
16 from the initial draft, and we support inclusion  
17 of these concepts in the final PEIS; however, the  
18 Supplement is largely silent in two areas  
19 critical to having a successful solar development  
20 program, and this gives us cause for concern.

21           While improved siting measures are  
22 included in the Supplement, parallel provisions  
23 for mitigation and improved best management  
24 practices for key resources, notably groundwater,  
25 are not. A clearly articulated robust mitigation

1 framework coupled with improved best management  
2 practices for averting harm to species and  
3 habitats is clearly needed as the agency both  
4 moves forward with its new solar energy zone  
5 concept and especially as it continues to act on  
6 those existing applications.

7           Conservancy previously offered ideas on  
8 these topics in comments to the initial draft  
9 PEIS, which is the point; these issues are not  
10 or were only minimally addressed in the  
11 Supplement. Scores of the existing applications, as  
12 well as applications that will be processed per  
13 the Supplement, will likely be handled  
14 inconsistently on a case-by-case basis. Without  
15 uniform guidance put in place, unwarranted harm  
16 to species and habitats will occur, and the benefits  
17 of regionally optimized mitigation will be  
18 sacrificed. Site designation and mitigation are  
19 so inextricably bound that proposing new siting  
20 criteria without dealing with mitigation is  
21 fundamentally incomplete and improper.

22           The SEIS mentions regional conservation  
23 plans relative to the SEZs but provides no detail as  
24 to what they are or how they'd be designated,  
25 structured, or implemented. Optimal mitigation

1 should be based upon landscape-level plans for  
2 each SEZ, which clearly identify regional  
3 conservation priorities. The plans should have  
4 a clearly delineated standardized method of  
5 assessing impacts when quantifying compensatory  
6 mitigation. They should establish transparent  
7 third-party delivery implementation and  
8 a monitoring mechanism. They should ensure that  
9 any mitigation is enduring over the life of the  
10 impact, even in perpetuity in addition to --  
11 in addition to meeting over and above existing  
12 management obligations. Plans such as these will  
13 provide certainty to developers without  
14 mitigation requirements.

15           Developers should be allowed to satisfy  
16 mitigation responsibilities for ecological  
17 impacts through funding the implementation of a  
18 plan. The benefits of a facilitated regional  
19 mitigation approach include, not only permit  
20 efficiencies and greater financial predictability  
21 for the developer, but also the ability to focus  
22 offsets required for mitigation on key  
23 conservation priorities providing benefits to  
24 sensitive species, enhancing and restoring  
25 critical and important habitats, improving



1 conductivity between habitat areas and better  
2 long-term protection, and maintaining the long-term  
3 viability while allowing solar developments to  
4 continue in the future.

5 The Nevada currently proposed  
6 Amargosa Valley SEZ presents one example of  
7 risks incurred by failing to adopt protective,  
8 clear, and needed performed mitigation with  
9 associated best management practices.

10 The BLM is presently conducting a  
11 proposal to bring a 500-kilovolt transmission  
12 line and 36-inch gas pipeline to the area just  
13 south of Pahrump.

14 While this infrastructure would  
15 initially serve a concentrating solar plant on  
16 private land in California, it is apparent that  
17 additional plants in Nevada were contemplated  
18 according to the utility proposing this  
19 infrastructure.

20 These facilities will all be located in  
21 the Amargosa River watershed in groundwater basins --  
22 groundwater basins that are considerably  
23 overappropriated and hydrologically connected to the  
24 river. The Amargosa River system is almost  
25 wholly dependent on groundwater yet hosts a whole

1 class array of endemic sensitive species.

2 And my time is up. We'll -- I want to  
3 thank you for the opportunity to provide these  
4 comments. We'll provide more detailed and  
5 expansive comments in the future.

6 Thank you.

7 SPEAKER: My name is Gary Vesperman, and  
8 for 19 years I have been accumulating information on energy  
9 sources and so forth. My Web site is  
10 padrak.com/vesperman and has about 300 pages  
11 written about energy -- I have chosen three big  
12 generators to bring to your attention. Two of  
13 them can produce half as much as Hoover Dam and  
14 one can produce nine-tenths of Hoover Dam. The first one  
15 is a hydromagnetic dynamo. A donut-shaped  
16 hydromagnetic dynamo as big as a two-car garage  
17 could safely and reliably generate a thousand  
18 megawatts, minus its 10 megawatts sustaining  
19 input power for 25 years or more with no fuel, no  
20 pollution, and minimal maintenance.

21 It was built in Armenia in the early 1990s  
22 a hydro -- prototype hydromagnetic dynamo. It  
23 generated 1.5 megawatts, only weighs 900  
24 kilograms, and has a diameter of 2 meters.

25 Water flows through the toroid and enables

1 the hydromagnetic dynamo to function as an  
2 over-unity electrostatic transformer.

3 Capacity can range from a hundred  
4 kilowatts to a thousand megawatts. The cost of  
5 electricity is about a tenth of a cent per  
6 kilowatt-hour. Seven, 1,000-megawatt  
7 hydromagnetic dynamos can be virtually stacked  
8 to combine into a single 7,000-megawatt fuelless  
9 hydromagnetic dynamo. That is much better than  
10 burning millions of pieces of land just to get a  
11 few megawatts of solar power; okay?

12 The second one is an electrino fusion power  
13 reactor. Unfortunately, it only comes in one  
14 size, 1,880 megawatts. That's nine-tenths of  
15 the Hoover Dam. A linear accelerator collides two  
16 beams of electrons at 940 million electrons  
17 volts.

18 The electrino fusion power reactor's  
19 size is 80 feet long, 10 feet wide, and 10 feet high.  
20 A hundred fifty pounds of brass would be consumed  
21 over a hundred years before it has to be shut  
22 down for rebuilding of the accelerator.

23 The company that makes these accelerators  
24 is in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Another  
25 accelerator, it uses eight, 35- to 50-megawatt

1 pulsed klystrons, magnets, power supplies, and so  
2 forth.

3           The first prototype 1,880-megawatt  
4 electrino fusion power reactor cost \$125  
5 million. A subsequent electrino fusion power  
6 reactor was \$40 million. That's \$40 million for a  
7 generator with nine-tenths of the power of the Hoover Dam.  
8 Much more cost-effective than renewable energy  
9 and solar energy.

10           Finally -- this is a mouthful. I'm  
11 sorry -- electronic spiral toroid spheromak  
12 micro-fusion reactor. It was derived from an  
13 explanation for ball lightning. It's a plasma  
14 toroid. It's self-organized and self-stable with  
15 no magnetic fields to contain it. The fuel is  
16 hydrogen and boron. Safe, pollution-free  
17 micro-fusion reactors could reliably generate  
18 electricity with capacities ranging from 10  
19 kilowatts through to 1,000 megawatts at  
20 10 percent of today's electricity price.

21           So again, my Web site has all this  
22 information, [www.padrak.com/vesperman](http://www.padrak.com/vesperman).

23           By the way, if you really like to read,  
24 the electrino fusion power reaction, it's 500  
25 pages. So the bottom line here is I've been a

1 member of the Sierra Club for many years. I'm  
2 ashamed of the Sierra Club and the other  
3 environmental organizations. You should be  
4 fighting solar power and wind energy. What  
5 you're asking for is spoiling beyond belief of  
6 the beautiful wild lands, when the alternative is  
7 more than one kind of safe,  
8 nonpolluting generators.

9           SPEAKER: Good afternoon. My name is  
10 George T. Rowe, R-O-W-E. My friends call me  
11 Tommy. I am chairman of the board of the County  
12 Commissioners for Lincoln County. I'd like to  
13 start out this evening by saying that the County  
14 is presently preparing written comments for this,  
15 and they will be submitted before the deadline.

16           I'd also like to, while I'm up here,  
17 thank the Bureau of Land Management for working  
18 with the local government up there and excluding  
19 the Delamar Valley and the East Mormon Mountain  
20 zones. It was very beneficial.

21           I'm not going to take much time. Just a  
22 couple of things I would like to say. There's  
23 two or three things in that report, especially in  
24 the appendix noted where it says that they --  
25 that the BLM may work with local government. It should be

1 they should work with the local people. They  
2 must work with the local people, not only with  
3 the local government but with the local  
4 sportsmen, with the local ranchers, the local  
5 farmers, the permittee holders. Lincoln County  
6 is 90 percent federal land. Most of that is BLM  
7 land, and most of all of that is grazing land.  
8 And the permittees have had their permits in  
9 there for years. They need to work with all of  
10 these groups before they make a decision, and  
11 again, thanks BLM for working with the local  
12 government. Hope they will continue to work with  
13 the local government and the local people.

14 Thank you.

15 SPEAKER: My name is Connie Simkins,  
16 C-O-N-N-I-E, S-I-M-K-I-N-S.

17 And when Senator Reid and  
18 Secretary Salazar came forward with the idea of  
19 solar energy zones and making Nevada the leader  
20 in renewable energy, Lincoln County stepped to  
21 the plate and said, okay. Three of the seven  
22 areas in Nevada that are studied as solar energy  
23 zones are in Lincoln County. We took a look at  
24 those. These are in valleys that I have lived in  
25 and played in all of my 67 years. I know nothing

1 about the other areas that are being discussed in  
2 this report.

3 We support -- Lincoln County supports --  
4 the continuation of multiple uses that take place  
5 on this land today. We support renewable energy  
6 on -- in site-specific places using  
7 technology-specific projects.

8 I was excited to hear the folks in the  
9 introduction talk about action plans and  
10 mitigation plans and the gentleman that mentioned  
11 best management practices. As Commissioner Rowe  
12 has said, we feel this is the only way this will  
13 work is to get everybody involved upfront,  
14 transparent. Lincoln County has participated as  
15 a cooperating agency in this document, and we  
16 expect to be consulted all the way along.  
17 We're -- we want to be involved in the planning,  
18 the construction, and in the operations of these  
19 plants.

20 We need to be involved in the design of  
21 mitigations using adoptive management, so when  
22 something happens in our county -- we carry out one of  
23 our plans. If it works, we keep doing it. If it  
24 doesn't work, we don't keep doing it. We quit  
25 doing it. It must be adaptive.

1           We do support the East Mormon and the  
2 Delamar exclusion areas. And we've supported the  
3 reduced size of the North Dry Lake where invited.  
4 We recognize the work done by the BLM and DOE and  
5 the Argonne National Lab people who have  
6 identified these areas as solar exclusion areas  
7 because of the negative impact to the natural and  
8 the cultural resources.

9           We feel like these valleys are our  
10 cultural resources. We have lived there and  
11 played there and worked there all our lives.

12           The study areas at East Mormon Mountain  
13 and Delamar and 50,000 acres of the northernmost part  
14 of the North Dry Lake solar energy zone should be  
15 permanently labeled as "solar exclusion areas,"  
16 not variance areas from -- and kept from utility-  
17 scale solar development. We feel like if it's  
18 unsuitable, as far as it goes through this  
19 document, if it's unsuitable for solar  
20 development, it should never have to be  
21 considered a variance area. It should be  
22 included permanently. And we do support the  
23 Air Force training and flight needs in these  
24 valleys.

25           Thank you very much.



1                   SPEAKER: Good evening. My name is  
2                   Jane Feldman. That's F, as in Frank,  
3                   E-L-D-M-A-N. I'm a spokesperson for the local  
4                   chapter of the Sierra Club. Our chapter of the  
5                   Toiyabe chapter is all of Nevada and a sliver of  
6                   Eastern California. And we have 5,000 members in  
7                   our chapter. Thank you, Gary. And we have an  
8                   outreach to almost 40,000 members and friends  
9                   here in our chapter. The Sierra Club has a formal  
10                  policy, a formal energy policy that gives priority  
11                  to energy efficiency and distributed generation.  
12                  The Sierra Club also has a formal policy that  
13                  acknowledges that we will need utility-scale  
14                  renewable energy in order to meet our goal of  
15                  avoiding the worst impact of climate change. And  
16                  so we are working enthusiastically to protect our  
17                  deserts and have renewable energy projects sited  
18                  in appropriate places. We know that doing these  
19                  projects smart from the start is an important  
20                  part to make that happen.

21                  The Sierra Club activists here in Nevada  
22                  worked diligently with partnering organizations to  
23                  make intense comments on the draft EIS, and we  
24                  are gratified to see that so many of our comments  
25                  were incorporated into the Supplemental EIS, and

1 we continue to work with the Supplemental EIS and  
2 be involved with the process.

3 We are particularly interested in seeing  
4 the specifics on the process to work with  
5 variance requests, and we're also interested in  
6 the exclusions that need to be fine tuned.

7 For example, the citizen-proposed  
8 wilderness, as I've already mentioned. The  
9 hotspot Nature Conservancy has identified as by  
10 diversity hotspots in Nevada. We'll be very  
11 interested in.

12 One of the things that we're looking  
13 forward to is more information on the mitigation  
14 that will be expected and how it will be  
15 processed for each one of the solar projects.  
16 And one of the things was mentioned already  
17 rather briefly, when Jim Moore was talking, that  
18 mitigation needs to be durable, enduring, and long-  
19 term, the words that our colleague, Jim Moore  
20 was saying from the Nature Conservancy.

21 The Endangered Species Act acknowledges  
22 that, when impacts are persistent to perpetuity, the  
23 mitigation should be persistent to perpetuity.  
24 And what I'd like to point out is that here in  
25 Nevada, 90 percent of our state is in public land

1 management. And so there is very, very little  
2 opportunity to do mitigation on private land.

3           When you're doing mitigation on public  
4 land, that presents a challenge to make sure that  
5 mitigation is persistent to perpetuity. That's  
6 one of the things we're going to be interested in  
7 pursuing in the final EIS when this is produced.

8           Another thing that has been talked about  
9 to some degree already tonight is finding  
10 alternate siting for solar energy projects,  
11 alternate siting on brownfield or previously  
12 disturbed land of one kind or another. And this  
13 particular programmatic EIS doesn't investigate  
14 those kind of alternatives in depth. We're very  
15 interested in making sure that those kinds of  
16 opportunities are looked at closely so that it  
17 relieves the pressure on the BLM land and the  
18 precious desert ecosystems as Gary Vesperman has  
19 already pointed out is very important for us to  
20 protect here in Nevada in the Toiyabe chapter.

21           One of the things that some of us just  
22 recently have been able to appreciate is a BLM program  
23 that's being pursued in Arizona that is formally  
24 doing surveys to identify brownfield and other  
25 previously disturbed land for solar development.

1 If the BLM office here could have a similar  
2 program in Nevada and in California, we think we  
3 could really take advantage of alternate siting  
4 for renewable energy.

5 These oral comments are relatively  
6 brief, and we really appreciate being able to  
7 speak at this hearing tonight, and we -- the  
8 Sierra Club is planning on making more complete,  
9 written comments in the future.

10 Thank you.

11 SPEAKER: Good evening. My name is  
12 John Hiatt, H-I-A-T-T, representing Red Rock  
13 Society here in Las Vegas, and thank you for the  
14 opportunity to present comments tonight.

15 Clearly the Bureau is playing catch-up  
16 with regards to dealing with solar energy.  
17 You've got 33,000 megawatts worth of projects  
18 already being pipelined. That's more than can be  
19 built in the foreseeable future. Certainly  
20 that's more than we're going to see Nevada  
21 applications for.

22 I think that one of the things that  
23 we're seeing here is this whole process  
24 illustrates the need for a new planning  
25 paragon for the Bureau. We're looking at

1 industrialization of potentially hundreds of  
2 thousands of acres of BLM land in the California and  
3 Nevada deserts, the plan of which will be  
4 irreversibly changed. This is a new thing for  
5 the BLM. This is not grading. This is not  
6 mining. This is not things which on a relatively  
7 smaller scale will go away or  
8 potentially go away after a period of time.

9 We also have, not just these projects,  
10 but we have all the associated infrastructure that  
11 goes with them in terms of, not only generating  
12 energy, but transmitting it to its final  
13 utilization and everything in between, which is  
14 not just transmission lines but maybe make a  
15 substation and maybe a distribution center.

16 So we need to somehow be able to take a  
17 single look at the whole picture so we understand  
18 what's going on and not just sort of deal with it  
19 in piecemeal fashion like the BLM has done things  
20 historically, where you basically wait for people  
21 to come to the Bureau and say, "This is what we  
22 want to do," and then you deal with it; I think we  
23 need to move forward. I'm very pleased to see  
24 that this programmatic EIS is an attempt to do  
25 that, but I think it basically falls short.

1           In view of the very rapid evolution in  
2           change in the solar energy industry, I think that  
3           this document will be obsolete in a relatively  
4           short order and should have a clearly stated  
5           date for revision and revisiting, probably no  
6           more than five years. If we see where we were  
7           five years ago and where we are today, this  
8           document is not going to be valid at that point  
9           in time.

10           I'm very disappointed to see that in  
11           Nevada, in spite of comments made with regard to  
12           the programmatic EIS, we still have 9 million  
13           acres of variance areas. If the large number of  
14           acres in SEZs is not enough, then somehow we  
15           haven't done or you haven't done a good enough job  
16           of identifying where those SEZ areas are. We  
17           should not need to have large numbers of acres  
18           for variances. Essentially that -- that short  
19           circuits the whole process and causes further  
20           problems and puts everything at risk.

21           People would like to have certainty at  
22           least for a specific period of time to know that,  
23           once we've decided where we're going, that's where  
24           we're going to go. We don't have to worry about  
25           things changing all the time.

1           Also the SEZs need to be prioritized.  
2           There are certainly values to society in building  
3           projects closer to transmission and closer to  
4           load centers than just having them as SEZs. In  
5           other words, the SEZ by Tonopah doesn't have the  
6           same value as the SEZ within 20 or 30 miles  
7           within Las Vegas in terms of its relative value  
8           getting power to market. So we need to somehow  
9           be able to give preference to those SEZs which are  
10          closer to market, closer to transmission, or  
11          already have existing transmission use.

12                 With regard to Amargosa Valley, you have  
13          a statement in this Supplement that you will  
14          prefer low water-use projects. I'd like to know  
15          what the definition of low water use is. And in  
16          this exceedingly arid desert that is the Mojave,  
17          almost any water use turns out to be significant,  
18          and historically, people look at groundwater as  
19          kind of inexhaustible, and in Nevada, we've got  
20          hundreds of thousands of acre-feet of permitted  
21          groundwater rights where we don't have any  
22          water, or we have insufficient water to meet  
23          that demand on a long-term basis. So adding more  
24          demand in those areas is not beneficial to the  
25          long-term health of the resource, and so we

1 certainly need to have that defined just as to  
2 exactly what low water use is.

3           Also, one thing I have not seen with  
4 regard to the SEZs is will there be -- will these  
5 areas allow complete wall-to-wall development or  
6 will there be wildlife corridors through the development? --  
7 How would we deal with these very large,  
8 relatively large areas which potentially can be  
9 completely converted to industrial uses and  
10 obliterate wildlife that's now using them and  
11 maybe even more importantly wildlife that has to  
12 transmit or trans -- trans -- go across those  
13 corridors to get to areas on the far side.

14           So these are some comments for tonight.  
15 I will be submitting additional written comments  
16 at a later date.

17           Thank you.

18           SPEAKER: Good evening. I'm  
19 Aleta Joan Dupree of Las Vegas of the  
20 Paradise Road neighborhood. And thank you for  
21 the opportunity to speak tonight.

22           I come here as a citizen of this city,  
23 of this state, Nevada, my beloved home. I'm a  
24 veteran of the United States Army, honorably  
25 discharged, and proud to have served my country.



1           And I come here as a user, a consumer of  
2           electricity in my daily life. I practice  
3           conservation time of use where possible in my  
4           home. And I like to think I'm a fairly savvy  
5           user of it, and I live in an all-electric home;  
6           so I'm dependent on this important resource, and  
7           I believe that there are many options for us.  
8           And utility-scale is an option. I think it's an  
9           important option. I think it's a necessary  
10          option, and most of our power, in the  
11          United States, is utility-scale that stands  
12          today. I believe we have to develop a clean  
13          energy future, and we have to do it responsibly.  
14          We have to look at the whole picture. We want to  
15          minimize our use of water where possible. If  
16          there's a waterless technology out there, let's  
17          push towards that.

18                 We certainly need to look at all of the  
19                 options -- rooftop solar and distribution and  
20                 conservation. Okay. I'll project here. And  
21                 well, we have to have all of these options on the  
22                 table. And -- okay. Another memory lapse here.  
23                 So please forgive me. And we have to have  
24                 certainty.

25                 We're going to be retiring power plants

1 over the next 10, 20 years, and beyond. They're  
2 going to have to be replaced. We have to ask  
3 what are we going to replace them with? Ideally  
4 it will be to replace them with clean renewable  
5 energy. We are going to have to face this fact  
6 as the older power plants age and they  
7 become less sufficient and they become dirtier  
8 unless they are re-powered and rebuilt. We are  
9 going to have to face the decision should we  
10 industrialize old desert? No. Too much of  
11 anything is not good. Let's take a balanced  
12 approach.

13 Ah, yes, a nice, electrically powered  
14 microphone here. Thank you.

15 And the plants have to be sustained. We  
16 can't locate the plants where there's not enough  
17 water because then they can drain all the water  
18 out. People can get hurt. We don't want that  
19 because then it won't be sustainable, and that's  
20 going to defeat itself.

21 I think it's important to have focus in  
22 our development, and there also needs to be  
23 processes for exceptions, whether it be allowing  
24 the plant to operate or denying the plant the  
25 ability to operate. This comes through a process

1 that is streamlined but also deliberative, but we  
2 have to look at the signs, and we have to look  
3 also at the impacts on the people because we all  
4 need to be good neighbors out here in the world,  
5 and we need to work together so that any project  
6 we have, I hope and pray will be welcome. As I  
7 draw my electricity in my daily life, I hope to  
8 wait for that day when it will be cleaner as it  
9 goes, by looking at the whole picture trying to be  
10 in touch with where this necessary resource comes  
11 from. This should not be out of sight or out of  
12 mind.

13 Thank you for your time.

14 SPEAKER: I'm Lynn Davis, Senior Program  
15 Manager for the National Park Conservation  
16 Association (NPCA). We are a membership organization  
17 based -- founded almost a hundred years  
18 ago shortly after the National Park Service was  
19 created, to work on behalf of the national parks.

20 We have participated with a coalition,  
21 many of the members of whom have spoken tonight.  
22 So I will make our comments brief.

23 We thank the BLM and Department of  
24 Energy for the opportunity to identify and to  
25 hone in on areas that are more acceptable for

1 renewable energy development.

2 NPCA supports clean energy development.

3 We recognize the perils, increasing perils of  
4 global climate change particularly in our  
5 national parks. We think that the Supplemental EIS  
6 is certainly a step in the right direction in  
7 identifying -- in stating a preferred alternative  
8 with the PEIS and reducing, in particular, the  
9 Amargosa SEZ which has significant impacts on  
10 Death Valley National Park and also in some of  
11 the decisions related to the California SEZs, in  
12 particular, one associated and very -- within very  
13 near proximity to Joshua Tree National Park.

14 As such, we will be submitting more  
15 comments in working with the coalition. We would like  
16 to advocate that more focus be put on distributed  
17 energy. We believe that there can be more done  
18 in this regard rather than building  
19 industrial-scale projects. We certainly appreciate the fact  
20 that the PEIS -- excuse me -- that the document has  
21 considered water resources and also orienting  
22 renewable energy close to existing transmission  
23 lines.

24 Thank you.

25 SPEAKER: My name is Laura Cunningham.

1 And I live in Beatty and Nye County Nevada, and I  
2 just have a really quick comment on the Miller's  
3 solar energy zone because I'm a bird watcher and  
4 there's a really unique birding area, Miller's  
5 rest stop, which is actually an artificial area  
6 right on Highway 95 that has trees and water.  
7 And it has proven to be one of the more  
8 phenomenal places for neotropical line-breeding  
9 birds of all kind, other types of birds that stop  
10 over. And it's a little oasis. And I believe  
11 it's only about a mile or two from the boundary  
12 of the solar energy zone, and one thing that I  
13 have found living in a small rural town of Nevada  
14 is eco tourism is sort of a growing important  
15 economic driver for places like Tonopah, Beatty,  
16 other small towns around rural Nevada. So I'd  
17 like to suggest some studies such as absolutely  
18 no power towers be put in Miller's solar energy  
19 zone because small birds will fly through the  
20 concentrated beams and be zapped. So having that  
21 right next to this world-class rare bird location  
22 might not be good.

23 But also I'd like to encourage studies  
24 of how birds migrating will be attracted to a  
25 large lake-like photovoltaic project. That's

1 something that needs a lot more study. So just a  
2 quick alert that Miller's solar energy zone has a  
3 lot of interesting impact that needs to be  
4 studied. Thank you.

5 SPEAKER: My name is Richard Arnold,  
6 Pahrump Paiute Tribe; and I'm actually here to  
7 share some thoughts about the Supplement draft  
8 the programmatic SEIS. And I found a few things  
9 kind of distressful, actually, about the actual  
10 document.

11 First and foremost I wanted to say that  
12 I also support the exclusions of the East Mormon  
13 and Delamar Valley areas. And interestingly, as  
14 you've heard, there's a lot of important areas  
15 and resources within all the SEZs. And one of  
16 those happens to be cultural resources. And as a  
17 native person, I think that there is a lot of  
18 concerns that we have about those. Moreover,  
19 when I look at and heard in the introductory  
20 remarks there will be more work that will be  
21 needed for cultural resource study, that pleased  
22 me. However, I think on the ethnic ground there  
23 can be studies. That has not been mentioned and is  
24 absent in the process. It needs to be  
25 included in order to fully understand and

1 evaluate the area.

2           Within the Supplement, it mentions the  
3 distance between the solar energy zones and  
4 the tribes, and it appears to be inaccurate.  
5 Because apparently is what they're done, they  
6 will take the distance from the SEZs to where a  
7 tribe is located, assuming that the tribe only had  
8 ties to that little immediate area. It's  
9 forgetting that the rest of the land all around  
10 is within a cultural landscape, what was native  
11 land. So it needs to be expanded beyond what the  
12 current scope is, and that needs to be corrected  
13 and is fatally applied as it is.

14           The other, I think, with that related to  
15 a group, when I look at Amargosa and it talks  
16 about the SEZs there but it also excludes the  
17 sand dunes there, but the sand dunes are an  
18 integral part culturally and ecologically a part  
19 of that landscape there. You can't talk about  
20 one little area that's bounded by an artificial  
21 fence line or what have you that where nothing  
22 else outside is going to be interconnected. Of  
23 course, with that, you have all the animal life,  
24 that doesn't recognize those boundaries, neither  
25 do our -- culturally, we don't recognize those

1 boundaries, and I think, when you look at  
2 viewsheds and you look at sunscapes and storyscapes,  
3 those also cross over.

4           The -- initially, when there was some  
5 discussions in the draft EIS, there were some maps  
6 that were used that kind of illustrate the  
7 area. However, now in looking at the draft -- I  
8 mean, I'm sorry -- looking at the Supplemental,  
9 there are massive transmission lines -- corridors  
10 that't aren't included, but those aren't  
11 previously shared. So now we're supposed to only  
12 get the benefit of this meeting up until the  
13 closing of comment to provide our responses, and  
14 that seems disingenuous.

15           I think, if we're talking about  
16 transparency, we're trying to gain support of a  
17 project, I think we want to make sure we have all  
18 the cards on the table.

19           The other is that, when I look in the  
20 Supplement, it talks about the cumulative  
21 effects -- actually, it's two sections,  
22 environmental justice and cumulative effects --  
23 there are none. And I find that really  
24 interesting because this document is something  
25 that is being co-shared by Bureau of Land



1 Management and Department of Energy.

2 Right across the street from the  
3 Amargosa Valley is the Nevada National Security  
4 site, and in 1996, the environmental impact  
5 statement in the Record of Decision, there were  
6 statements in there that reaffirmed and  
7 acknowledged that there was a disproportionate  
8 impact to the tribes for that area. So that  
9 wasn't even considered. And so now to see in  
10 this document that there are none,  
11 obviously, again, it's flawed.

12 When I look at environmental justice,  
13 you know, the same thing holds true within  
14 the Amargosa Valley where it was acknowledged  
15 that there were holy land violations because  
16 our place of creation is within that cultural  
17 landscape. And no other individual or group  
18 experiences that. Health violations that are  
19 relevant perceived risks that should be evaluated  
20 have not been and cultural survival and potentially  
21 access violations. Once the land is restricted,  
22 then we're going to inherit more problems.

23 No systematic evaluations of  
24 traditional places within the area of potential  
25 effect have been completed. The EIS can be used

1 really to clear the area. That's one of the  
2 stressful things that I think that the tribes are  
3 really looking at because we know that, once this  
4 document goes out, a Record of Decision goes out,  
5 this document will then be tiered later on and be  
6 used for reference to all other kinds of things  
7 cumulative, which we have a lot of different  
8 situations.

9 As the last speaker, I'm trying to  
10 really wrap up here, and only because it's very  
11 stressful in seeing that we're limited to just  
12 this small amount of time. I'm really trying to  
13 get through this. So if you will just indulge  
14 me.

15 That -- you know, the listing for the  
16 acreages that are going to be used -- and we see  
17 the acreage for California. We see the acreage  
18 for Nevada. I think this is really also  
19 misleading because one of the problems that I see  
20 is that a lot of these projects are being  
21 situated in the desert, which is typically  
22 considered as a wasteland for people, and for  
23 us, we don't consider that as a wasteland.

24 It's all coming -- a lot of projects are  
25 coming toward the border, the California-Nevada

1 border. Kind of out of sight of California may  
2 be out of sight of other people. And definitely  
3 we sure don't want to have it in someplace that  
4 might interfere with somebody's steads. But it's  
5 okay to put it in our area.

6 In the documents, it talks about  
7 avoiding areas that adversely affect (inaudible)  
8 resources and values. And the BLM has contacted  
9 six tribes within the Great Basin.

10 First of all, I don't think it does  
11 define what the Great Basin is. Secondly, some  
12 of the tribes that were involved fall within the  
13 Mojave Basin outside of the Great Basin; so that  
14 needs to be corrected and clarified.

15 Thirdly that the -- many of the tribes,  
16 six tribes that are there, we left out many other  
17 tribes that should be a part of this. When I  
18 look at other states, there are tribes that are  
19 absent. In New Mexico, there were no tribes that  
20 were contacted; but you have a process in here  
21 that says you send out letters. That was very  
22 disingenuous. As because in 2008, letters were  
23 sent to the tribes asking that -- this is really  
24 informing them about this project, not really  
25 asking for any further documentation or any

1 action. Some tribes responded to the opinion  
2 we're still very interested. Some tribes  
3 didn't -- we're waiting to hear. And there was  
4 no coordination with the local office, which  
5 again, caused a lot of problems and confusion in  
6 the same document. There in the same document,  
7 it talked about it's going to be -- that some  
8 tribes had provided complete documentation. That  
9 needs to be defined whatever complete  
10 documentation is because nobody knows what that  
11 particularly is, and I think, again, caused very,  
12 very -- a great deal of confusion.

13 Winding down and lastly here, you know,  
14 it's been talked about in here that the BLM will  
15 contact all the other tribes -- and this is a  
16 quote, with cultural and or historical ties to  
17 the SEZs and land available for development to  
18 explore if they share similar concerns or issues  
19 to those revealed in the study.

20 Well, what about all the other studies?  
21 I mean, all the other tribes that have not  
22 participated, and we're saying now this is  
23 complete. Again, fatally flawed.

24 We believe the long-term mitigation  
25 really needs to occur, and then I think under the

1 mitigation, I think that -- under that long-term  
2 mitigation, that we need a perceived risk study  
3 to understand and evaluate the cultural  
4 implications to the solar projects.

5           And in closing, the last statement I  
6 will make. It's very interesting to me, as far as  
7 I know and out of all the traveling that I've  
8 done, the sun still comes up all over the place.  
9 For some reason, we decided that it needs to come  
10 in our backyard and not in others.

11           Thank you.

12           SPEAKER: For the record, my name is  
13 Jeremy Drew with Resource Concepts Incorporated.  
14 I'm representing the N-4 Grazing Board this  
15 evening, but we also represented Lincoln County  
16 in this project.

17           I sure appreciate the time and effort,  
18 during the draft environmental impact statement,  
19 to listen to our concerns and even take the time  
20 to visit in the field in an effort to develop  
21 solar energy responses.

22           I've got to congratulate you tonight.  
23 I've never seen such a diverse group of interests  
24 echo the same sorts of comments. So we must be  
25 headed in the right direction.

1           I'm pleased to see that many of the N-4  
2           Grazing Board's Lincoln County  
3           recommendations were incorporated. We have  
4           supported and continued supporting dropping the  
5           East Mormon Mountain, Delamar, and portions of  
6           Dry Lake Valley north as SEZs. We would rather  
7           see them designated as exclusion areas instead of  
8           variance areas.

9           We support the emphasis of the  
10          development within these SEZs, and we also  
11          appreciate the development of the variance process as  
12          well as the new SEZ development revision process;  
13          however, there needs to be more emphasis on local  
14          input, and we will be providing more detailed,  
15          written comments and suggestions on how to do  
16          this. Thank you.

17          SPEAKER: My name is Don Reid, Global  
18          Finance Corporate. What I'd like to ask is a basic  
19          question. Is there a plan for regional  
20          integration of transmission and generation?  
21          Because if there isn't, are we talking about the  
22          land to nowhere? I mean, just how we can set up  
23          these zones, but if there's no coordinated plan  
24          with the biggest market, California, what have we  
25          accomplished? And how much time and effort have

1 we put into the PEIS process because it's got  
2 great goals, and I applaud it. But if we don't  
3 integrate the PEIS with transmission on an  
4 integrated regional basis and generation, what  
5 are we talking about? Do we have something  
6 realistic? Are we talking about a wish?

7 Thank you.

8 (The proceedings concluded at 8:51 p.m.)

9

10

\*\*\*

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1           I, the undersigned, a Certified Court  
2 Reporter of the State of Nevada, do hereby  
3 certify,

4           That the foregoing proceedings were taken  
5 before me at the time and place herein set forth;

6           That any witnesses in the foregoing  
7 proceedings, prior to testifying, were duly  
8 sworn;

9           That a record of the proceedings was made by  
10 me using machine shorthand which was thereafter  
11 transcribed under my direction;

12           That the foregoing transcript is a true  
13 record of the testimony given.

14           Further, that before completion of the  
15 proceedings, review of the transcript [ ] was [X]  
16 was not requested.

17           I further certify I am neither financially  
18 interested in the action nor a relative or  
19 employee of any attorney or party to this action.

20           IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date  
21 subscribed my name:

22

23 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

24

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kimberly M. Lowe  
CCR No. 849

25