## **Transcript**

# Solar Energy Development Programmatic EIS Scoping Meeting held in San Luis Obispo CA, July 9, 2008

This Acrobat PDF file contains the transcript of the above referenced Solar Energy Development Programmatic EIS public scoping meeting. If you are interested in reading the scoping comments provided by a specific person or organization at this meeting, you may use Acrobat's search tool to locate the commenter's name/organization within the transcript.

## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

+ + + + +

SOLAR ENERGY DEVELOPMENT
PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
(PEIS)

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

+ + + + +

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY, JULY 9, 2008

+ + + + +

The above-entitled meeting convened at 6:30 p.m., at the Embassy Suites San Luis Obispo, 333 Madonna Road, San Luis Obispo, California, Halil I. Avci, Ph.D., facilitator, presiding.

#### PRESENT:

TIM SMITH
Bureau of Land Management

BRAD RING
Department of Energy

LINDA RESSEGUIE
Bureau of Land Management

## ${\color{red} {\tt C} \ \ {\tt O} \ \ {\tt N} \ \ {\tt T} \ \ {\tt E} \ \ {\tt N} \ \ {\tt T} \ \ {\tt S}}$

#### PAGE

Dr. Avci 3
Presentations:
Tim Smith, Field Manager Bakersfield Field Office of BLM
Brad Ring, Project Manager, DOE Golden, Colorado Office
Linda Resseguie, BLM's PEIS Project Manager 13
Lynn Billman Senior project leader, NREL 22
Overview of NEPA process - Dr. Avci 35
Q&A Session 44
Comment Phase 59
Adjourn

### <u>PROCEEDINGS</u>

DR. AVCI: If you'll please take your seats, we'll get started.

I have 6:30 p.m., according to my watch, and this meeting is now officially convened.

On behalf of the U.S. Department of Energy and the Bureau of Land Management, we thank you for attending this meeting.

This is what's called a Public Scoping Meeting for a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.

The Programmatic Environmental

Impact Statement that is the subject of

tonight's meeting is one that is being

prepared by the U.S. Department of Energy and

the Bureau of Land Management on solar energy

development in six Western states, Arizona,

California, Colorado, New Mexico, Nevada, and

Utah.

My name is Halil Avci. I'm with

Argonne National Laboratory, the organization

that is supporting DOE and BLM in preparing this PEIS.

At this time, I have a request for you. If you have not done so already, please turn off the sound on your cell phones and pagers.

As you may have noticed already, I have used several acronyms. I've used DOE for U.S. Department of Energy, BLM for Bureau of Land Management, and PEIS for Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.

This being a federal program, invariably there will be others throughout the evening that you will hear. We will try to explain what they mean as we go along, but if there is one at any time, that you do not understand, please raise your hand and we'll be happy to explain it.

I also would like everyone to know that this meeting is being transcribed. An official document will be prepared for the record. That means everything that is said

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

this evening will be recorded, and will be entered into the official document. The document will be placed on the project Web site and will be available for viewing and downloading by the public. Our court reporter this evening is Troy Ray and he's with Neal R. Gross & Company out of Washington, D.C.

The main purpose of the meeting this evening is for DOE and BLM to obtain your input on the scope of the PEIS.

However, before we begin with the comment phase of the meeting, we have a series of short presentations to give some background about the scope of the PEIS and proposed activities.

After the presentations, there will be a brief question-and-answer period.

Immediately after the questionand-answer period, we will start the comment phase of the meeting. I'm estimating that the comment phase will begin about 7:30 p.m.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Now as our first speaker, I'd like to introduce Mr. Tim Smith. Tim is BLM Field Manager for the Bakersfield Field Office here in California. Tim, please.

MR. SMITH: Thank you. Thank you very much, and I want to express my appreciation to Argonne and Department of Energy and to our national office for coming out here and conducting these scoping meetings. This is an issue and an opportunity across BLM that's been happening, and so it's good to have this type of effort occur.

Just real briefly, the Bureau of
Land Management in the Bakersfield Field
Office we cover nine counties, and so San
Luis Obispo County is one of ours as well as
all the way up to Madera and down through
Kern and Tulare and several others.

But this is a good opportunity for, I think, everyone to learn something about solar, to find out where the agencies

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2 opportunity tonight. So I'll hand this back. DR. AVCI: Thank you, Tim. 3 The next individual I'm going to 4 introduce is Brad Ring. Brad is project 5 manager in DOE's Golden Office with the Solar 6 7 Energy Technologies Program. MR. RING: Thank you. I'd like to 8 also thank you for coming tonight and 9 10 participating in this process. I'd like to take just a few minutes and go over the DOE 11 12 overall goals and the expectations from this 13 Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. The overall, the DOE goals are to 14 15 add energy supply from diverse sources, and 16 specifically making better use of renewable resources. When this is accomplished, we'll 17 improve the quality of the environment by 18 19 reducing greenhouse gas emissions and 20 environmental impacts. Another key component of this is 21 our national security. We feel that adding 22

are going, and I really appreciate the

these diverse renewable sources to our energy portfolio will provide secure, sustainable, emission-free domestic energy, which is important to our country.

The Solar Program resources in 208 was about \$170 million. The majority of that went, 152 to research and development, and the research and development was primarily focused on photovoltaics, it was about 126 million, with concentrating solar power having 26 million. Market transformation, the 18 million that's shown there, was for -- or is for activities associated with the 25 Solar America cities, development of codes and standards, Solar America showcases, solar training across our nation, and the Solar Decathlon.

The two technologies that I talked about regarding the funding level, if you recall, those are two -- we split them out as two technologies. There's sub technologies within that group and there is some overlap,

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

but overall, we consider it two specific areas.

One of them is photovoltaics, which most people are aware of, which converts solar energy, solar radiation directly into electricity, and the second one is concentrating solar power, which concentrates the solar energy on to a fluid, increasing the temperature and pressure of that fluid, which is then used to drive, for example, a standard steam turbine or other mechanized method to produce energy.

Along with this, while we talk a lot about concentrating solar power, I also want to mention that DOE Is focusing on developing both of these technologies to the point where they could be cost competitive with utility markets. And how we do this is we evaluate them based on what we consider -- it's called a LCOE, or Levelized Cost of Energy, and that is all of the cost associated with a specific system that either

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

a home owner, a commercial enterprise or utility is putting in all of those inputs from permits, construction, operation and maintenance versus what is derived from that, how much energy comes out of that system.

And what we found is that we're finding continued improvements in all of the -- in both of these technologies, and they are becoming competitive, which is good news.

And while this occurs, we're going to see more, for example, on rooftops, more for commercial enterprises, and that is our goal.

DOE is co-leading the preparation of this Programmatic EIS, because we are focusing on utility scale projects, and those are the large-scale projects which can provide energy for tens of thousands of homes. But to get that kind of power, it requires intense solar radiation, and the six states that are included in this process have been found to have the best solar resources

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

in the United States.

To make a utility scale project does take a land mass, and it's approximately 5 acres for each megawatt. So you can see a 250 megawatt facility would take about 2 square miles, about two sections which is over 1200 acres. Right along with this, BLM manages over 119 million acres of federal land in these six states.

What we expect to get from this
Programmatic EIS is the specific
identification of land that's appropriate for
solar deployment, you know, both from a
technically and environmentally sound
standpoint. We want to establish policies
that would apply to solar energy projects
that we support, best management practices
which would include the identification of
important, sensitive or unique habitats in
the vicinity of the proposed projects, and,
to the extent feasible, design the projects
to minimize or mitigate these impacts.

1 It doesn't take away from -- each 2 specific project would be, would have its own 3 environmental analysis, and our goal is to ensure responsible energy generation. 4 Additionally, we expect to get 5 6 better, or more accurate modeling for solar 7 energy development, and along with this type of improvement in these technologies, the 8 jobs that would be created, and how the 9 10 technologies would mitigate the climate change that we're seeing. 11 12 That's all I have. Thank you very much for coming. 13 DR. AVCI: Thank you, Brad. 14 15 The next speaker is Linda 16 Resseguie from BLM's Washington, D.C. office. She is BLM's project manager for this PEIS. 17 MS. RESSEGUIE: Good evening. 18 19 want to echo what Tim and Brad said about 20 thanking you all for attending tonight. This is really an important issue, 21 and it's very important to BLM, to hear the 22

public comments during this scoping period.

The Bureau of Land Management is an Agency within the Department of the Interior that manages 258 million surface acres. Most of our surface acres are located in the Western United States and are displayed on the map that's now showing on the screen.

About 46 percent of our lands, or 119 million acres, as Brad said, are located in the six state study area, and here, in California, we have about 15 million acres that we manage.

The BLM's multiple use mission is to sustain the health and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations. The Bureau accomplishes this by managing activities such as outdoor recreation, livestock grazing, mineral development and energy production, and also by conserving natural, historical and cultural resources on the public lands.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Solar energy is one of many energy resources now being developed or considered for public lands.

To ensure the best balance of uses and resource protections for America's public lands, the BLM undertakes extensive land use planning. It carries out this planning through a collaborative approach with local, state and tribal governments, with the public, and with stakeholder groups.

The result is a set of land use plans that provide the framework to guide decisions for every action and approved use on our public lands. Many of BLM's existing land use plans, however, do not address solar energy development. The slide that's on the screen now talks about two directives to BLM that are important to this effort.

First is Executive Order 13212 that directs federal agencies to expedite their actions, as necessary, to accelerate the completion of energy-related projects.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

The second is the Energy Policy

Act of 2005. Section 211 of that act sets a

goal for the BLM to approve 10,000 megawatts

of nonhydropower renewable energy on the

public lands by the year 2015.

Now as I mentioned, BLM must manage its public lands for a variety of resource uses, including energy production.

The federal energy mix managed by BLM already includes coal, oil and gas, geothermal, wind and biomass, and soon it will include utility scale solar energy.

BLM has previously estimated that as much as two-thirds of the public lands may have high potential for solar energy production. Utility scale solar energy projects on public lands are authorized by BLM as rights-of-ways in accordance with the requirements of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act.

Now all activities proposed for public lands, including rights-of-ways, must

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

be consistent with the terms, conditions and decisions in approved land use plans.

Before BLM can approve a solar energy development project on public lands, it must assess the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of such development and must consider other resource values, sensitive areas, and public concerns, all accomplished through a NEPA process.

In the Notice of Intent announcing the preparation of this PEIS, that was published in the **Federal Register** on May 29th, BLM said that it was temporarily suspending acceptance of new solar energy applications, pending completion of the PEIS.

At the same time, we also announced that we were going to continue to process over 130 utility scale solar applications that had already been filed with BLM before that date. Those applications are mainly located in Southern California,

Nevada, and Arizona. they cover more than 1

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

million acres of public lands and they are projected to generate, if constructed, to generate 70 billion watts of power, enough to power more than 20 million American homes.

During this scoping period,
however, we have heard from solar industry,
elected officials and the general public, and
what we have heard were concerns, deep
concerns about waiting to accept new solar
energy applications, and in response to the
high level of concern, we reexamined the
policy, what I call the "no new applications
policy," and a few days ago, we announced
that BLM would continue to accept new solar
energy development applications while the
PEIS was ongoing.

So we will be continuing to work on the 130 applications previously received, plus any additional new applications, while we prepare the solar PEIS. And we're this in order to address the growing demand for renewable energy, while, at the same time,

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

assuring appropriate environmental protections.

The solar energy applications, both existing, those already on file with BLM, and any future applications that are received during the PEIS process, will proceed on a parallel track with the PEIS.

Go back one. Perhaps -- yes. BLM's programmatic goals. Thank you.

Under BLM's current solar energy development policy, applications are processed on a first come, first served basis, each with its own site-specific NEPA process, and that is an Environmental Impact Statement for the specific application, and each with its own land use plan amendment which would authorize the solar energy project to be built.

So the applications that are before us now, and any future applications, again, would be processed one at a time, case by case basis, with its own site-specific

NEPA analysis, and that would include a

Notice of Intent, a public scoping period for
that project, so that the public would be
involved in individual projects through the

NEPA process.

However, BLM believes that by looking programmatically at the issues associated with solar energy development, we will be able to develop a more comprehensive, consistent, and efficient program approach by which to address solar energy proposals on public lands.

The Programmatic EIS will identify public lands that are best suited to solar energy development, mitigation strategies, and best management practices to guide future solar energy development.

And another thing we are looking at in the PEIS is the need for possibly additional transmission corridors to specifically facilitate solar energy development.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

We think that the Programmatic EIS will be key to advancing understanding about the impacts of solar energy development and how best to deal with those impacts, and that the resulting decisions will better foster and support the nation's need for environmentally sound solar energy development.

Because BLM expects to amend land use plans in the six state area, to adopt the solar energy decisions that are made as a result of the Programmatic EIS, these meetings are also an important part of our BLM planning process.

In our Notice of Intent, published May 29th, we included proposed planning criteria, and we are also asking for your comments on our planning criteria at the scoping meeting tonight.

One last thing I wanted to say is that -- I wanted to remind the folks that are here, that this is about, from BLM's

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

perspective, this is about solar energy development on BLM-administered lands.

We aren't in a position to address specific applications because those will be handled with their own NEPA analysis and their own specific public scoping. This is about the broader programs and policies, and understanding the broader issues associated with solar energy development. Thank you.

DR. AVCI: Thank you, Linda. The next person who's going to speak is Lynn Billman. Lynn is a senior project leader with the National Renewable Energy Laboratories, NREL, for short. NREL is providing technical support for the PEIS with respect to defining the solar energy resources and technologies.

MS. BILLMAN: Hi. I also thank you for your participation here tonight.

I'm just going to give you a very brief overview of solar technologies that are being included in the scope of this

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, a little bit about the solar resources that we're looking at for this, and a couple comments that pertain to how we look at the penetration of solar into the marketplace for the 20 year scope of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.

So we are, as they mentioned before, we are looking only at utility scale, defining that as about 10 megawatts or more per project. There have been many, much interest and comments about distributed generation, putting PV panels, for example, on rooftops. That is not within the scope of this.

I'll mention a little bit about
the GIS type systems, Geographic Information
Systems, that are used to support the
development of the Programmatic Environmental
Impact Statement, and a mention about some of
the federal policies and the impact that they
can have on the future of solar development

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

in the Southwest.

Everyone has their way of categorizing solar technologies. Brad mentioned photovoltaics versus more solar thermal technologies. I'm going to speak to these in the context of which ones are more dispatchable. That means that a utility can have access to electricity from that source over a fairly broad, dependable period of time, versus those technologies that are not dispatchable, they only produce electricity when the sun is shining.

And in the category of technologies that can work reasonably effectively with storage, that enable the utility to use that electricity for a longer period of time during the day, there are parabolic troughs, power towers, and linear Fresnel reflector systems.

And I would just simply mention the pictures that go with those and then I'll talk about each one a little bit

individually.

The parabolic trough is in the upper left corner. That's actually a picture from Kramer Junction, California, which has been around for 15 years. That particular facility is 30 megawatts and it's part of a 354 megawatt collection of plants.

The power tower is the third one over, and I'll explain a little bit about that technology on the next slide.

The Liner Fresnel Reflectors is
the fifth one over and that's a relatively
new technology, especially here, in the
United States, and again, I'll describe that.

The technologies that typically do not operate with storage include Dish engine, dish/Stirling engine technologies -- that would be the fourth picture over -- those are individual units, monitoring units, that each individual unit is about a 25 kilowatt system.

Concentrating PVs, the second

picture over, there are several types of those that I'll mention. Flat plate PV is the last picture in the bottom right corner. You've seen many examples of that already.

One other thing I'll mention, I'll talk about the concentrating technologies first, and interestingly enough, most of these systems will concentrate sunlight to what we call 500 suns, that's about 500 times the sunlight that you would get, you know, from the normal, natural sun. Okay? Okay. The concentrated solar categories, the parabolic trough, as I say, they are a very, very commercial technology here, in the U.S., and internationally. 354 megawatts have been operating very reliably in Southern California.

The newest system in the U.S. is

Nevada One, which is south of Las Vegas.

That's a 64 megawatt system. Central

receivers are generally envisioned for larger

power plants, up to 250 megawatts.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	There is certainly a system
2	performing in Spain. There's one proposed
3	for Southern California. Let's see. The
4	reason we've mentioned if you'll go to the
5	next slide. The reason we've mentioned
6	dispatchable power as being quite important,
7	is if you compare the utility load, if you
8	look at that red dotted line, that's a
9	typical utility load for the Southwest, where
10	electricity usage picks up at about 6:00 in
11	the morning and it stays quite high until,
12	you know, 9:00 or 10:00 in the evening,
13	before it drops off. Whereas the solar
14	resource is shown by the yellow-colored area,
15	and that only matches about half of the
16	daytime lower. Whereas when you can have
17	thermal storage, you can extend the value of
18	that electricity, of that sunlight, through
19	the rest of the hours that are actually being
20	used.

Okay. Let's go to the next slide. For concentrating systems in the

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

21

nondispatchable category, as I say, the system on the left is a dish/Stirling -- oh, I didn't explain.

Parabolic trough technologies, in case you're not familiar with them, they use a long tube of a heat transfer -- of a fluid that can be heated to very high temperatures, and around that, too, is a linear mirror that is shaped as a parabola, focuses the sunlight, heats the fluid in the tube, and then that hot fluid goes to a generating station, and it flashes water into steam which drives a turbine. That's the basic concept for how you get the electricity.

The dish/Stirling systems

concentrate the sunlight on to that little

receiver in the center that you see, and it

actually heats the fluid and drives the

piston. So it's a different type of an

engine technology. And as I mentioned, these

are really precommercial units, about 25

kilowatts. However, there's interest in

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

putting a large number together. 400 of them will get you 10 megawatts and we believe that during the 20 year period of this study, that those are certainly technologies that could become commercial.

The picture on the right is concentrator PV systems. Photovoltaics is what PV stands for, and as Brad mentioned, in that context you're not using the heat from the sun, you're actually using the photons from the sun, and in a concentrator PV system, instead of heating a fluid at the center where the sunlight is focused, you're actually using a high-efficiency photovoltaic cell. The major cost in these systems is the PV cell, so if you can use a small area of cell and concentrate the sunlight, you can lower your overall cost of electricity.

These also are precommercial technologies being tested at Sandia and there's a lot of commercial interest beginning in these systems, and again these

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

are in the 3 to 25 kilowatt range.

Let's see. The next slide,

there's I think three pictures -- yes -- of

three different types, a repeated picture of

that reflective one, the refractive one -
there's a wide variety of ways to concentrate

sunlight, that people are exploring.

Okay. In the next slide, for all of these concentrating technologies, they depend on what we call the direct normal portion of the sunlight. That's the sunlight that hits the reflector at a 90 degree angle and the rest of the sunlight is not really captured.

So these can be used where there is very bright sunlight available most of the day.

I would also point out that this is a typical kind of a map that we would get from a geographic information system.

It shows the amount of solar radiation on BLM lands only. That's why

there's an awful lot of white spaces. Okay.

The data is gathered from a variety of sources, public databases, satellite data. Both NREL and Argonne, and many other national laboratories have extensive capabilities in using geographic information systems to analyze the applicability of solar systems in different areas.

You can screen out, for example, slopes that are too high to be stable. You can screen our environmentally-sensitive areas. So this is one of the tools that will be used in the Environmental Impact Statement process.

Okay. In the next slide, we go away from the concentrated technologies into the one nonconcentrated technology, and that's PV flat plate technologies. PV systems, as you may know, can either be fixed on the ground or they can be set up to track the sun, typically in one axis. There are

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

dual axis trackers, but the single axis are more cost-effective.

And this should be two pictures.

Yes. Nellis Air Force Base is the largest PV array in the country, 14 megawatts. There is a new array in California that is about 8 or 10 megawatts. It's just about the utility range that we're speaking of.

And the other system is in Portugal and that's a fixed lead plate system.

The next slide is a similar map; however, you'll notice the colors are not as deep red. This is for global solar resource.

A flat plate system can use the sunlight that comes directly at 90 degrees. It can use sunlight that bounces off of the ground, off of clouds. It can generate electricity in cloudy conditions.

Okay. The next slide. I would like to mention one of the key policy parameters that would be considered in this

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Environmental Impact Statement process as we look into the possibilities for solar in the future, and that's the federal investment tax credit. Right now, and for several years, people who invest in solar energy systems have been able to save 30 percent on their taxes.

That particular federal tax credit is set at this point to expire at the end of this year. You may have heard in the news of various machinations and discussions that have gone on in Congress, and that issue is not yet settled, as to where that's going to go in the future.

However, it is a large benefit, financial benefit to companies today that are interested in investing in solar.

And if you'll show the next slide.

Part of the Environmental Impact Statement

process preparation involves looking into the

future as to what the impact of solar could

be over a 20 year period, on many things.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

Environment, on jobs, on the economy, and so on.

And just to show you the impact of one of the key policies, this investment tax credit, this particular curve was calculated using hundreds of factors, using some modeling that we'll be doing to support this process.

And if there is no extension of a solar investment tax credit, the project is that around 2030, solar might have penetrated to the point of 6 or 7 gigawatts in the United States. If you show the next slide, Leo. If you want to assume -- you can make whatever assumptions you want -- but if one assumes that the investment tax credit would be extended for another eight years, and doesn't stay at thirty, but even declines, as the technology gets into the marketplace, that gives enough of a boost, that by 2030, we could very easily see 40 gigawatts of solar electricity in the country.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

So we just wanted to show that as an example of the kind of analyses that will be done to support the Environmental Impact Statement. And that's all I have to share with you. Thank you very much.

DR. AVCI: Thank you, Lynn. Now
I'm going to give you a little bit of an
overview of the NEPA process and the scoping
process. NEPA stands for National
Environmental Policy Act.

Now we've been talking about preparing the Programmatic EIS, but first of all, let's start with an EIS. I'm sure many of you have seen, or have participated in these types of meetings. But just as a way of conception, an Environmental Impact Statement process is a document that provides a comprehensive evaluation of the environmental and socioeconomic impacts of the federal agency's proposed action as well as a reasonable range of alternatives.

It describes the purpose and need

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

of the project. It identifies the environmental impacts and potential mitigation measures.

And it analyzes both the shortterm and long-term impacts as well as
cumulative impacts. Those are the impacts
that you get, not only from what's being
proposed, but when you add all the other
impacts that are going on, all the other
activities that are going on in the same
general area. And of course it also
describes the public's input and concerns.

Now why is this EIS needed? Well, the short answer is it's NEPA. NEPA requires that federal agencies, whenever there's proposed actions that have the potential to significantly affect the quality of the human environment, the federal agency is required to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement.

Now the proposed action may be site-specific, specific to a specific location and technology, or it could be a

broad programmatic action.

As in this case, it is a broad programmatic action that involves setting up solar energy programs for the two agencies.

Now if it is a specific, sitespecific EIS, then it's, you know, basically
for that site and technology. In the case of
the programmatic actions, it is called a
Programmatic EIS. Instead of evaluating
specific projects, it basically considers
generic and programmatic actions, and
potentially applicable mitigation measures.

Now we mentioned the reasonable range of alternatives. What are the alternatives that are being considered for this Programmatic EIS?

Well, no action alternative is a required alternative for NEPA. "No action" means what would happen if the proposed action did not take place? It doesn't necessarily mean nothing happens. It's just that the proposed action doesn't take place.

And then there is the proposed action. As you can see, the proposed action for this PEIS is developing and implementing Agency-specific programs that would facilitate environmental response to utility-scale solar energy projects.

Mentioned by the previous speakers. And for BLM, it meant amending the individual land use plans to adopt a new program. Now up to last week there was a third alternative which was called limited development alternative, and as Linda Resseguie mentioned in her presentation, that alternative is no longer relevant for this PEIS, based on the decision that BLM made last week -- lifting the moratorium on new applications.

At this time, the Agency has not decided if there will be a third alternative, or the alternatives, the two -- the first alternatives will be used. That decision will be made at the conclusion of the scoping

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

period.

Let's talk about the scoping period. Now there are actually two types of scoping. There is one, internal scoping, where agencies internally get together and evaluate what the proposed action is, what might be the potential alternatives and the certain impacts. At that point they publish what's called a Notice of Intent in the Federal Register. With the publication of Notice of Intent, the public scoping period begins.

The public scoping period is generally between 30 and 60 days. In this case, it started on May 29th, and it's going through July 15th.

It is during this time that the public is invited to provide input into the EIS. The type of input that's being asked is, you know, on the proposed action, alternatives that are being considered, significant issues to be analyzed, if there

are any concerns that, you know, the public or other agencies might have, possible mitigation measures, any data that others might have available, that could be useful in the development of the EIS.

So only after this public scoping period, that the decisions are crystallized in terms of what goes into the EIS.

So it's in this vein that BLM basically heard what the public was saying in previous scoping meetings that we had, and on the Web, that there was strong opposition to the third alternative, and as a result, instead of waiting until the end of the scoping period, they've been asked, that they would lift it.

So it's basically very much in line with the intent of NEPA. That's what NEPA is basically suggesting. That the federal agencies consider public input in their decision making, in estimating their environmental impacts.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

This scoping period is not the only time -- go to the next slide -- is not the only time the public gets a chance to provide input into this process.

When the draft EIS is published, which is currently scheduled to appear in spring of 2009, there will be another set of public meetings, public hearings, and there will be a certain period, generally 45 to 60 days period where the public will have an opportunity to comment on the process.

And then also, when the final EIS is published, currently scheduled to be spring of 2010.

Okay. Now I've mentioned the project Web site several times. I know some of you have visited this Web site because you have registered for this meeting on the Web site. If you have not done so, if you have not seen it, I would strongly suggest that you visit the Web site.

The address is solareis.anl.gov.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

There's a wealth of information about the program. It not only provides the information on EIS process but all the slides that are being shown today, all the posters that you see around the room, are actually on the Web site. You can go download them from the Web site.

It also has an e-mail notification system, that when you register with the program and put your e-mail address on the Web, whenever something happens with the program you get an e-mail notification.

For example, when the decision about the third alternative was made, there was an e-mail sent to everybody, and if you were on the Web site, you probably received it. Or you should have received it. Okay.

Now there are basically three ways to provide comments during this scoping period. One, at the scoping meeting tonight, via the Web site, or by mail.

Now the written comments, you

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

know, could be some of this through the Web site, but you can also send it to the address shown on the bottom of this viewgraph.

You can also, you know, if you have written materials with you tonight, you can also give it to me or to any of the PEIS staff, or at the registration desk before you leave tonight.

Now before we begin the open comment phase, as I mentioned earlier, we will have a brief question-and-answer period. This will probably last approximately 10 to 15 minutes.

What I will do is I will bring
the, this microphone to you, if you have a
question. You can address it to anybody on
the panel. I would ask, however, that you
please limit your questions to matters
related to presentations that have been made
up to this point, and the clarifying types
of questions.

If your question has the tone of a

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	comment, please hold that until the official
2	comment period begins. Okay? So we'll start
3	with the questions at this time.
4	Anybody has a question. Raise
5	your hand. Okay. One here; second one
6	there.
7	MS. MERRIAM: Thank you. Do we
8	need to identify ourselves?
9	DR. AVCI: Please.
10	MS. MERRIAM: My name is Karen
11	Merriam and I'm from the local Santa Lucia
12	chapter of Sierra Club. Listening to Linda,
13	and I'm sorry, I can't pronounce your name.
14	Linda Resseguie?
15	MS. RESSEGUIE: Resseguie.
16	MS. MERRIAM: Resseguie. And Mr.
17	Moderator
18	DR. AVCI: Halil Avci.
19	MS. MERRIAM: Halil. Hearing both
20	of your comments, I find I have a question
21	that ties to both, what you've both been
22	saying. I'm wondering, is if BLM is using

1	a one-at-a-time processing, as you were
2	mentioning, applications, how will the
3	programmatic approach allow for analysis of
4	cumulative impacts of all the applications?
5	So how can you look at well, I think that
6	says what I mean. And I do have another
7	question, if that's permitted.
8	DR. AVCI: You want to address
9	first?
10	MS. RESSEGUIE: No. I want you to
11	answer it.
12	DR. AVCI: Okay.
13	MS. RESSEGUIE: The programmatic -
14	- one of the strengths of the programmatic, I
15	believe, is going to be looking at cumulative
16	impact, creating the reasonably foreseeable
17	plan of development over the life of the
18	PEIS, and looking at the potential cumulative
19	effects of solar energy development across
20	the six state study area.
21	Each individual application that

is being processed now, and will be processed  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1$ 

during the time period while the PEIS is being worked, is also going to have to address cumulative effect, cumulative impacts, and I think that that is one of the -- if, if the PEIS were done first, those individual NEPA analysis, site specific, would be able to tier to the programmatic, and that would make that process much more efficient, because they would have the benefit of this previous analysis.

They aren't going to have that benefit but it will still need to be part of the environmental analysis that goes into each site specific. I'm not sure of what methodology will be used but it will have to be part of the individual site specific NEPA analysis for those projects.

And I don't know if that's responsive or not, but that was my sense of what you were asking.

MS. MERRIAM: Yes; yes.

DR. AVCI: I will also take that

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

as a comment for the PEIS, but just to follow up with what Linda said, that that's really a very important distinction between site specific analyses and programmatic analyses.

On the programmatic scale, it will be very difficult to say at this very specific location, what the cumulative impacts are, because we're working with a six state area, and if you want to go basically square mile by square mile, we'd never get out of this PEIS in the time that we're envisioning.

So it will be more on the general sense in the cumulative impact discussion, and the PEIS will be more in a general sense, what would be the impacts if these types of activities were taken in the same general area and what would need to be considered at the site specific level, which will be basically tiering off on the programmatic EIS.

MS. MERRIAM: And this will be

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	measured against factors like demand, market
2	demand, and that sort of thing, eventually,
3	when you're deciding, looking at the overall
4	policy for development of projects?
5	DR. AVCI: There will be some
6	development scenarios as to, you know, what
7	level of development would be and if
8	that's the level of development, what the
9	cumulative impacts would be, but it would not
10	be, again, in specifically at specific
11	locations.
12	MS. MERRIAM: Yes. I'm looking,
13	as you were saying, at the broader
14	DR. AVCI: Yes. The broader
15	scale.
16	MS. MERRIAM: The broader scale.
17	And I guess just a corollary to that was then
18	is that analysis also made with respect to
19	the, to other renewable resources? Like,
20	let's say, the development of wind or energy,
21	or the development of geothermal, and how

that's balanced out in terms of an overall

1	policy for development of renewable?
2	DR. AVCI: Well, wind has its own
3	PEIS that was completed. Geothermal has a
4	separate PEIS that's in draft stage. So each
5	one of those are addressing impacts in a
6	separate sense. But when you're looking at
7	cumulative, of course you need to include
8	those also in your analysis.
9	MS. MERRIAM: So if there is a
10	process for integrating those PEIS
11	DR. AVCI: The cumu
12	MS. MERRIAM: together, so
13	that you see the overall picture?
14	DR. AVCI: The cumulative impacts
15	analyses includes all actions, regardless of
16	who's causing the action. It could be
17	federal. It could be public. It could be
18	anybody else.
19	And so in that case, yes, every
20	foreseeable future action would be considered
21	in the analysis.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

We had one more in the back here.

1	Thank you.
2	MR. NORMANDIN: Hi. My name is Al
3	Normandin, and I just represent myself. I
4	had a question for Linda. On the chart, you
5	mentioned that in 2005, 10,000 megawatts of
6	electric, renewable electric power would be
7	approved. Your chart said it was required.
8	I think you mentioned it was a
9	goal. Is it a goal or is it a requirement,
10	and how doable is it?
11	MS. RESSEGUIE: Just to go back,
12	the chart talks about 10,000 megawatts of
13	nonhydropower renewable energy approved by
14	the year 2015, and that's an excellent
15	question, because what the statute actually
16	says is that the Secretary should "seek to
17	have approved"
18	MR. NORMANDIN: To seek. Oh,
19	okay.
20	MS. RESSEGUIE: And so it's I
21	call it "fuzzy language," and we consider it

a goal as opposed to a mandate. That's how

1	we're characterizing it. But it was the
2	Secretary "shall seek to have approved."
3	MR. NORMANDIN: So when the chart
4	said it was required, it's not really
5	required. It's more like a goal, like you
6	said?
7	MS. RESSEGUIE: It is like a goal.
8	Congress we certainly got the sense of
9	the congressional direction, that Congress
10	would like us to do this. So we are striving
11	to accomplish the goal.
12	MR. NORMANDIN: Okay. Thank you.
13	MR. RUSKOVICH: My name's John
14	Ruskovich. I'm from the Carrizo Plains, and
15	I have a question for Brad Ring.
16	You're telling us about the
17	project at Kramer Junction; how great it is.
18	When you're advertising that project, why
19	don't you explain to the people that it is
20	not a solar-only project. That it is a
21	solar/ natural gas, so it can run 24/7. So
22	it does put out greenhouse gases just like

Morrow Bay Power would do the same thing.

And why don't you also explain to the people, that if this is such a good deal, why did that company that built that plant, and about five others, why did they go bankrupt? Because this process is 14 to 16 cents per power, where PG&E produces it at 2.5 cents and sells it to the open market.

So can you explain to the public why all of a sudden this is such a good thing. If it's actually natural gas backed, how can it be no greenhouse gases? You want to see the document where it even says the Department of Energy -- these are natural gas-backed solar? It is.

MR. RING: I'm not sure that's part of this discussion. I don't know the specifics. I know that there is some fossil — I really don't know that system completely. There is some fossil backup to it but the majority of it is concentrating solar power.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

DR. AVCI: I need to object. That is a very specific project you're talking about and it was mentioned in Lynn Billman's presentation, that there are different types of technologies, some dispatchable, some not dispatchable. Some have storage; some don't have storage.

So I think what you're saying, one project needing a backup at certain times because the sun is not shining during that time, is well-recognized within the solar energy community, and that's going to be considered in the analysis.

Next, please.

MS. GROOT: My name is Henrietta
Groot. I know you're working on BLM land.
However, how are you going to coordinate with
the California authorities? California has
an integrated energy policy, and as long as
you're having transmission facilities from
BLM land elsewhere, how are you going to
integrate with the excellent California

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

policy?

MS. RESSEGUIE: Let me try to address your question. We are working with a number of California agencies, including the California Energy Commission, the CPUC, California Department of Fish and Game. They have actually formed a interagency working group to assist us with this PEIS, and we've scheduled regular meetings with them.

We're also taking into account the work that California is doing on the Renewable Energy Transmission Initiative, the RETI. Also the Western Governors Association Initiative pertaining to renewable energy zones.

And the other thing we're taking into account is the -- we call it the section 368, Westwide Corridor Study, that's ongoing. So those similar efforts, and the agencies that are working on those efforts are being incorporated and coordinated with as we undertake this PEIS.

MS. GROOT: And this will be part
of the PEIS?

MS. RESSEGUIE: Their input will

MS. RESSEGUIE: Their input will be part of the PEIS. Yes.

DR. AVCI: One more.

MR. MALONEY: Hi. Tom Maloney of the Nature Conservancy. Brad, you mentioned a acreage-to-kilowatt sort of ratio that's somewhat -- you made it sound like it was a standard, and I'm wondering, across the various technologies, what the impact on footprint is, acreage, you know, covered, and whether or not that will be specifically assessed in the Programmatic EIS?

MR. RING: You know, that's an estimate that's used. There's a range of acreage per megawatt by the technology and as the technologies progress or change, I've heard different numbers from five, even to seven or eight acres per megawatt, depending if you have storage or other attributes to your solar systems.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	So it would be addressed. It
2	would have to be addressed as part of the
3	whole at least as part of the project.
4	I'm not sure if it's addressed as part of
5	this PEIS. I'm not sure, but as a project,
6	it would.
7	DR. AVCI: I know there are quite
8	a few questions. If you have short ones,
9	we'll have two more. One here, and then one
10	there, please. Okay.
11	MR. BARBOUR: Hi. Greg Barbour.

This is a question for Linda. Of the applications that the BLM has, what is the -do you have metrics as far as how much time it takes from applicant to permit?

MS. RESSEGUIE: No metrics currently exist, Greg. But I can tell you this. We have not yet approved any solar energy development projects on BLM land. have one project, we call it the Ivanpah Project, over towards Nevada -- it's in California but near the Nevada state border -

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- that is the furthest along, and we initiated a Notice of Intent, I think it was last November, and we're expecting to have a draft program -- or not programmatic -- a draft Environmental Impact Statement out on that project later this fall.

So that one has been about a year from -- to draft. We don't have any template out there because we're just getting started with these. But my expectation is that it's going to be easily a year or longer to do the environmental, site-specific environmental work for each project.

MS. BELL: Hi. Robin Bell, and I have, I think, a really simple question, and I apologize for being a total lay person in this, and I'm just trying to grasp the concept of programmatic EIS and how it correlates to site-specific EIS.

Will the programmatic EIS have -define your total program plus have
guidelines for the site-specific EISes? Is

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

that how this would work?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. RESSEGUIE: Let me answer your question by talking about the programmatic Environmental Impact Statement that BLM completed in 2005 for wind energy.

We did a similar approach, it covered all of the 11 Western states, and what came out of that was a record of decision that established some best management practices and mitigation measures, and I think 52 land use plans were amended, kind of all at once, to adopt those standards, and subsequent to that, we also came out with Bureau directives, a policy that took all of these policies that were decided, and made them uniformly applicable to all BLM lands. So that a wind energy developer in one state would have the same standards applied to them that would be in another state.

So it streamlines the sitespecific environmental work, and it provides

consistency and certainty to developers about what will be expected of them, and in that way facilitates the development. People know more what to expect from BLM as opposed to a company coming to a particular field office, and then having to sort through it all by themselves. You get more variation that way.

So that's what we're hoping to get out of the programmatic solar, is this overarching guidance and policy that will be applicable in all cases.

DR. AVCI: Okay. We'll start with the comment phase now. Okay. Here's how we'll proceed. If you'll go to the next slide. Some of you registered online, and some of you registered for the meeting at the door when you came in tonight. At the time you registered, you were asked if you wanted to speak tonight, provide oral comments. Those of you who said "yes," I have your names in my hand. I will call you to the podium to present your comments over here, at

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

the podium.

After everyone who has registered to speak has had a chance to speak, I will ask if there is anyone who has not registered to speak but would like to, after hearing the presentations and other speakers.

Now in order to allow equal chance for everybody that's speaking, every speaker is requested to limit his or her comments to three minutes, total. If you are one of those speakers here at the podium, and when you reach the two and a half minute mark, I will be sitting here and I will be showing you a yellow card, to indicate that you have 30 seconds to wrap up your comments. When you reach the three minute mark, I will show you the red card. That means your time is up and you should immediately conclude your remarks.

If you are not finished with your comments at the end of three minutes, and you need time to add to your comments, you will

be given the chance to do that after everybody who wants to speak has had a chance to speak, at the end of the meeting.

During this time there will be no sharing of time, and passing of left-over time to another speaker.

Now is everyone clear on how the comment period of this meeting will be conducted? Are there any questions on the process? Okay then. We will now begin the formal comment phase of the meeting. When you come to the podium, please get close to the microphone and speak directly into the microphone so the court reporter can hear your comments and record them. Before you begin your comments, please state your name and affiliation.

The first speaker tonight will be Tim Strobridge, followed by Greg Barbour, and then Robin Bell. So we'll start with Tim Strobridge, please.

MR. STROBRIDGE: Well, my name's

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Tim Strobridge. I didn't really write anything specific to speak about. I'm just going to speak off the top of my head. But I do believe solar power is a good thing, and I also believe that there are companies out there that are hiding behind the solar name, and they're not a good thing.

In the Carrizo Plains, for example, there are two companies, one, OptiSolar that wants to cover 10 square miles of agricultural land with solar panels, and put up cyclone fences, and prevent the natural habitat of antelope and elk, and other very valuable species to proliferate in that area.

Ten square miles is a big area, and there's also another company that is hiding behind the name of a solar farm, which is -- it's a thermal industrial site.

They're going to have cooling towers that are 115 feet tall. Their whole side is 56 feet side. It's going to be an eyesore. It's

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

going to make noise. They're going to produce hazardous waste on a daily basis, that has to be trucked out, and that hazardous waste has to go somewhere.

Our community is going to have to make room for this hazardous waste that they're going to produce, and like I said, solar is a good thing when it's put in the right place, built with the right designs.

My personal feeling is solar belongs on rooftops and not on ag land, and it has no business there. Thank you.

DR. AVCI: Thank you, Mr. Strobridge.

Next, Greg Barbour.

MR. BARBOUR: Hi. Greg Barbour.

I live in Atascadero. I sustain a living on my property. I'm a manufacturer and a product developer. I have extensive financial and time interest in silicon-based PV solar technology. And right now, the industry, worldwide industry is capitalizing,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

getting the capital in place to manufacture an extensive amount of silicon-based PV solar cells.

I have a list of detailed comments that I'll submit. I don't have time with the three minutes to go through the whole list. You know, just the "big picture." You know, there's going to be online gigawatts, lots of gigawatts of solar material's going to be available to manufacturers and people who can deploy these systems to whatever class solar installation. My personal interest is going into a residential plus class and a commercial class, where it's about an acre. But our business plan, we see that we're going to need about 100 square miles of solar space in the next 15 years, and that amount of space, you know, if it's ideal, you know, and it's just the ball park, is enough energy, it's about 1.4 terrawatts of energy, which is equivalent to the United States' consumption of oil per year.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So as a goal, you know, in my numbers -- I saw the charts that Linda put up and those are great, but they're -- I think they're low-balling what could happen.

And just to give you background on PV solar technology, it's been around for 50 years, it's a Siemens process, and it's just creating polysilicon, which is an abundant mineral, and there's no -- in the manufacturing process, it is -- in a closed loop system, it's toxic-free, and the longevity of these solar systems are -- or their solar cells are about 40 years.

And they require very minimal sustaining costs, and this is one specific section of the solar picture, but it's technology that's already proven. But it has extensive labor elements that is becoming capitalized right now. So that the world is capitalizing this technology to remove the -- so I can finish up, you know, at the end of the meeting. But thank you.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

DR. AVCI: Thank you, Mr. Barbour.

Next, we have Robin Bell. And then

following Robin Bell, we'll have John

Ruskovich and Susan Harvey.

MS. BELL: Hi. I'm Robin Bell and I have a home on the Carrizo Plains, and we've got a lot of solar plant activity out there. There's currently six solar companies on the California Independent System Operator queue, who have intentions of building in the area. Only two companies have disclosed the details.

And as Tim mentioned, there's 10 square miles of these combined two companies, and it seems like when you're evaluating your land of where these plants could go, a lot of time could be saved if you evaluate sensitive areas where they just shouldn't go at all.

For instance, these plants are going to take up 10 square miles of an area that California Department of Fish and Game says has one of the highest concentrations of

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

special status species in the state.

It just doesn't make any sense to put it there. Look for some other places.

The other thing, it would be a direct conflict with state programs that reestablished the Tulio, and the prong-horned antelope in this area. It's a -- this 10 square miles is an important migration corridor for the, and the antelope are actually there on a daily basis.

So that's a direct conflict with a state program. It seems like we could save a lot of time by establishing areas where it will be a conflict.

Also, another thing we're facing is a short cut where AUSRA is looking for the U.S. Fish and -- or the Army Corps of Engineers to claim jurisdiction over a drainage ditch on their site. In that way they can get a short cut to the U.S. Fish & Wildlife conservation plan where -- I'm not sure if I have all the wording right -- but

where a comment is issued rather than a conservation plan which would take four years, and this just seems like an environmental short cut. I don't see why that should be allowed.

Also when these companies are doing their environmental test, it would be in a way that's unbiased. For instance, this AUSRA company is -- has a company that's doing tests directly under their supervision.

Well, we're finding a lot of things that are skewed in that, in the human area, such as sound samples at our homes.

Well, we can police that but who's going to police the blunt-nosed leopard lizard and kit fox studies? I think it should be structured so that they're more unbiased studies.

Also, the solar thermal plant shouldn't be in an area where there's a water sensitivity issue, where water is a scarce resource. Again, common sense.

Again, it shouldn't be -- these

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

plants shouldn't be located in areas adjacent to residences, where a small number of people are going to have an unfair burden in establishing renewable resources in this country, where their community, their environment, their visual resources, their water and their property values are all affected. That just doesn't seem to be fair. Oh. And one last thing.

I understand that there's some heat issues regarding solar plants, that they're going to raise the temperature in the community or in the environment, and I think that should be really looked at. Thank you.

DR. AVCI: Thank you, Ms. Bell.

Next we have John Ruskovich.

MR. RUSKOVICH: My name's John
Ruskovich. I'm a rancher from Carrizo
Plains. My two neighbors have expressed the
size of the solar plants but what they forgot
to comment was how little energy they were
going to actually create on a large-volume

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

scale.

Now a lot of your land -- you know, I don't know who actually owns it, like in Nevada, whatever -- but BLM does manage for Nature Conservative just south of us, to bring that back into like how it was 150 years ago. Well, I don't think it's right for BLM to even consider letting gigantic solar plants come out on to areas that they're working with other agencies to try to save precious wildlife, and that is also for the public's, you know, camping spots, or whatever, to build these solar power plants. That's the public's property.

If you're going to have solar, why don't you put it on BLM land that they control with the Department of Energy, that also the oil companies lease, and are part of the oil plants, like outside of Taft, California, where your property lines dot all over the Central Valley. That's where these nauseous plants should be built instead of in

agricultural lands, or in small communities 1 2 that BLM surrounds. 3 So just remember your neighbors around you, when you're trying to consider 4 what you want to do by their impact. You're 5 6 not showing any of these solar power plants that are 300 feet tall. And they have them. 7 They're on the History Channel and 8 everything else. 9 Some of these plants are totally 10 bizarre in size and shape, and they don't 11 12 produce very much. So think about your 13 neighbors around you. Don't think it's a great policy. 14 15 Thank you. 16 DR. AVCI: Thank you, Mr. Ruskovich. Next, Susan Harvey. 17 MS. HARVEY: Good evening. 18 19 name is Susan Harvey and I'm the president of 20 North County Watch. North County Watch is a 501(3)(c) nonprofit organization committed to 21 22 sustainable development in north San Luis

Obispo County. We are concerned about development, and other land use issues, that impact the environment, natural resources, conversion of ag lands to other uses, and quality-of-life issues.

I feel like a person who's just arrived at the bus station, only to see that the bus left like 30 seconds ago. I'm really disappointed to find out that you're going to be accepting applications, and while this process is going on.

We support your efforts to take a comprehensive look at the role and impacts of alternative energy choices on BLM lands, including identifying policies that minimize damage, and protect natural and cultural resources for solar projects, and to not process applications for national monuments in other lands in the national landscape conservation system. I assume that's still in place.

Our experiences with proposed

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

facilities on the Carrizo Plain, these facilities are not located on the monument, but the issues they raise are universal.

Concerns we have about the siting of alternative energy plants in remote areas include lack of nearby resources and labor for construction of the facilities, the impact of massive construction projects in remote areas can have a very detrimental effect on the habitat and local communities.

This is evident when looking at the numerous proposals for facilities that you have here, and when you speak about 130 applications generating 70 million megawatts, and these are all presumably in -- going to be -- they're dealing with areas that are very remote.

Alternative energy facilities should be located within the communities they serve, to promote local control of energy needs. Local community choice minimizes impact to large interconnected electrical

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

grids. Facilities being proposed in the Carrizo Plain will feed power lines that will ship the power to the San Joaquin Valley.

Completion of the projects are likely to require the upgrade and expansion of two substations. So we're talking about, when you're talking about like needing transmission lines, that there's tremendous kinds of things like that that could -- I mean, potentially, they're amazing to me, that all of these things just kind of fall like dominoes, and suddenly, there we are.

A special concern are the impacts to sensitive desert areas like the Carrizo National Monument. Deserts are very slow to repair from assaults on the environment.

Potentials for increased

deficiency of facilities located in desert

areas need to be thoroughly assessed and

judged in relation to other economic factors

and noneconomic factors. What is the true

cost benefit of the extra efficiency compared

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

to locating small-scaled plants on industrial rooftops in the San Joaquin area?

Sensitive lands need to be protected. These lands should not be thought of as potential industrial sites. Large-scale development is incompatible and inappropriate. I'm attaching a short article from the IEEE spectrum that provides a cautionary example of the need to look at the whole picture -- local, regional and beyond.

Assess the needs; assess the impacts.

And I have two questions from the presentation today. I'm curious about tax credits. It's been -- there was once a solar facility in the Carrizo Plain, and after the tax credits ran out in ten years, they sold it off and it disappeared.

So are you going to be looking at

-- how long are the tax credits going to

last? Are you going to be assessing,

rehabilitating the lands when the life of the

plant leaves? And how long does approval

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	last if the plant isn't funded, meaning if
2	you approve of a plant and it doesn't get
3	funded, is that approved permit is it in
4	perpetuity, or does it have a life? And I'm
5	sorry, I didn't even watch you. Thank you.
6	DR. AVCI: Thank you.
7	MS. HARVEY: A lot of good those
8	cards did.
9	(Laughter.)
10	DR. AVCI: I think I'm going to
11	have to start employing a different
12	methodology. Okay.
13	Next, we'll have Peter Schwartz.
14	MR. SCHWARTZ: I have nothing to
15	say.
16	DR. AVCI: Okay. Then we'll start
17	next, we'll have Polly Cooper, and she'll
18	be followed by Henrietta Groot.
19	MS. COOPER: My name's Polly
20	Cooper. I'm a local architect. Linda, you
21	mentioned something about criteria, that you
22	were also requesting some sort of input

about, and I didn't catch what those criteria might be. So if you have a chance to clarify that, it would be helpful. I think maybe they were generalized land use or something.

I'm wondering if the programmatic EIS has any section that would evaluate the different types of solar technologies relative to particular issues. I think it's been brought up about water use in certain areas is a real issue, and some of these technologies use it and some don't. So I'd like to know if that's part of it.

And I would like to congratulate people who've mentioned that they are doing everything that they can to conserve and to generate their own power, because I heard people say they think solar is a good idea, yet we know that it doesn't come absolutely free. But it's us that are driving the requirement for this kind of a development, and so many of these things really are industrial scale, and some are going to be

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

put in places that aren't in our own backyards.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So we're forcing things to happen and it's our responsibility to use 20 percent of what the standard diet of this country has been requiring. We are wasting almost the world. We're causing global warming. driving this kind of development. We are at risk here, in particular -- I came down Cuesta Grade to come to this hearing, and it was clogged for miles, for some minor accident, and that's supposed to be an evacuation route for this area. So there are so many impacts from energy use, and I just want to encourage people to look at their own habits, and are you shading your windows now that it's summer? because if you're not there's something -- well, you may just be hot. But if you're using electricity to air condition yourself, perhaps there's something wrong there. Maybe those questions can get addressed.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

One other thing is I don't know if there's any way -- there must be, some place, that these alternative wind and solar possibilities are measured against continued and expanded coal use, and nuclear power, because I think they'll come out shining, but we -- it's a reality in this country, that there's this insatiable appetite. So it's a real interesting dilemma that we're in right now. Thanks.

DR. AVCI: Thank you, Ms. Cooper.

Now we have Ms. Henrietta Groot.

MS. GROOT: My name is Henrietta
Groot. I'm affiliated with the Unity With
Nature group of the local Quakers. Thank you
for inviting our comments. I would urge you
to make it a very strong rule, that you will
not impact any areas of particular
significance -- suggest national monuments,
state parks, any kind of local park, any kind
of environmentally-sensitive area, any kind
of land that can be beneficially used as ag

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

land. And so you should not locate anything off these projects, in these areas, nor next to it, because if you put it next to these areas we'll have impacts in the Carrizo Plains anyway.

What needs to be used for your project is areas that are already degraded, such as old oil fields. You have some of those.

(Laughter.)

MS. GROOT: Now who benefits from all of this? I would hazard to guess that it's the utility companies that are going to put up these projects. So I feel you need to track what their profits are as compared to the benefits from rooftop energy generation.

In other words, why put a project in the middle of the desert, if it is easier, better, more financially feasible to buy a whole bunch more of rooftop PVs? I know you are BLM, and you have to do what you have to do. But rooftop energy generation could

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

certainly be a mitigation for whatever damage you do.

Also, I hope you will make an effort to evaluate the loss of energy by distant transmission, because the closer the source of power is to where it's needed, the less loss of energy. If you're going to transmit way away to San Joaquin Valley, you're going to lose a lot of energy, and that should be made clear in your projects, in your PEIS.

And I would also hope that at some point you compare the various kinds of renewable energy sources. In other words, don't just keep wind energy in one pigeonhole and solar in another pigeonhole. Make an effort to compare the benefits, please.

Thank you.

DR. AVCI: Thank you, Ms. Groot.

We have now come to the end of the list for people who have registered to speak.

At this time, is there anybody who has not

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

spoken so far and would like to speak?

Please raise your hand. Anybody else? Okay.

Since we don't have you as a registered speaker, when you come to the microphone please clearly state your name and your affiliation for the benefit of the court reporter, and you'll also have three minutes to speak, as like everyone.

MS. STROBRIDGE: Good evening. My name is Mary Strobridge. I'm a resident of San Luis Obispo County and an interested person in what's happening in the Carrizo Plains. I do want to start off saying that I'm not opposed to solar energy. However, I want you to realize that solar energy isn't always environmentally friendly. There is collateral damage that sometimes overrides the need for solar energy.

The Carrizo Plains. A lot of times, people here in this county think that the Carrizo Plains -- they think of it as barren wasteland. It is not a barren

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

wasteland. It is environmentally diverse.

It's a beautiful area. It's also the gateway to the Carrizo National Monument, and with these plants coming in, that are proposed, coming in, the AUSRA plant and the OptiSolar plant, it would destroy the aesthetics and the environment in the Carrizo Plains, and it would destroy, actually, the way the Carrizo Plains looks as people come in to see the Carrizo National Monument.

Some of the things that we are concerned about in the Carrizo Plains is water usage. The governor has declared a drought -- I guess you want to call it a warning -- but a drought. Here, in California, AUSRA will be using 20,000 gallons of water a day. Agricultural land that'll be used is approximately 10,000 acres with the solar plants that are being proposed.

That's a huge loss of agricultural land in this time when we are short of food

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

and there are wars being fought over food.

As far as habitat and environment, if you have not already read the Fish and Game report, please do so. It's an absolutely incredible report about what will happen to the Carrizo Plains if these solar plants come in. And of course the community out in Carrizo Plains have lived there, some, for generations. Some of us who have family out there are reasonably new in the last seven to ten years. But we love the Carrizo Plains.

And also the lady asked who was sponsoring or funding the plants. They're funded by venture capitalists working with PG&E, and I hate to say this, but Al Gore also works for one of those venture capitalists. And so I was really disappointed with him.

But I think that we need to think about -- otherwise, this, almost a gold rush -- but a solar rush to get solar energy, and I think that there's being damage that is

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	going to be done. I believe that solar
2	energy should be met at the point of need,
3	and that is at each resident, or each
4	business, before we go and we take
5	agricultural lands and destroy the
6	environment. Thank you.
7	DR. AVCI: Thank you.
8	Is there anybody else who has not
9	spoken so far, who would like to speak?
10	(No response.)
11	DR. AVCI: Is there anybody who
12	has spoken and would like to add to his or
13	her previous comments?
14	Again, when you come to the
15	podium, please state your name and your
16	affiliation, and you have three minutes.
17	MR. BARBOUR: Three minutes; not
18	enough time. But we'll see what we can do.
19	Greg Barbour, resident of Atascadero,
20	sustain my property, and a product developer,
21	and I'd like to make a I guess a request.
	i e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e

You know, for a business plan to deploy the

amount of solar that is necessary to offset the energy demands of industries like automobile, transportation, electricity for the home, there's an enormous amount of energy required.

Oil has a massive amount of energy, and we're competing with that. You know, for me to design a system, and a package, so that it's cost-effective, so that we can deploy this in spots wherever it's appropriate, we've got to have these templates, and we've got to know what the requirements are.

We have to have this boilerplate - hey, this is what the rules are. The
"rules of the road." And we've got to have
the "big picture" in mind. And the "big
picture" is, you know, a terrawatt of solar
energy. And the energy that I'm focusing on
is keeping it simple, PV solar, silicon-based
PV solar. It's a very environmentallyfriendly manufacturing process, and the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

materials, in the end, are all recyclable.

It's aluminum, copper and silica, and it could be recycled.

But, you know, in order to effectively deploy this system, we have to do it at a reasonable cost.

And you mentioned how the solar credits are going to expire this year. A lot of the cost in the solar assistance is the deployment, the time it takes to get the permit, the time it takes to do the installation, and there's a lot of overhead that gets piled on top of these installation systems.

So, you know, I'm working on a plan, so that it's -- we've got -- hey, we've got this system, we could drop it where it's needed, and to give you an idea of the current cost of solar cells, is \$2.36 per watt, and within two years, it's going to come down to about a dollar a watt, because the supply and demand curve.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	We're getting more supply of this
2	material, and that's going to drop the prices
3	of the material. So, you know, demand is
4	going to come up. So it's a inherently
5	deflationary product, and especially with the
6	global economy now getting on line to measure
7	up to our standards of living where they're
8	consuming oil like we used to. We have to
9	plan ahead, to offset, you know, that need.
10	And I will submit my comments. I've got to
11	"massage" them a little bit but I'll submit
12	them, and if you guys have any more
13	questions, you can feel free to call me, or
14	e-mail me, what have you. Thank you.
15	DR. AVCI: Thank you. Anybody
16	else who would like to add to his or her
17	previous comments, or would like to speak for
18	the first time?
19	Do we have anybody else who would
20	like to come up?
21	(No response.)

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

DR. AVCI: Okay. In that case, I

1	would like to thank all, thank you all for
2	coming. Special thanks to those who provided
3	comments. Just a reminder that the comment
4	period for the PEIS runs through July 15th,
5	2008. If during this time you have
6	additional comments, or you have comments for
7	the first time, you can send them to the
8	address shown at the bottom of this slide, or
9	you can go on the Web site, solareis.anl.gov,
10	and provide your comments that way.
11	I wish you all a safe trip home or
12	wherever your destination might be.
13	It is now 8:13 p.m. according to
14	my watch, and this meeting is officially
15	adjourned.
16	(Whereupon, at 8:13 p.m., the
17	meeting was adjourned.)
18	
19	
20	