

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.

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