

00001

1

2

3 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND BUREAU

4 OF LAND MANAGEMENT

5

6

7 SOLAR ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

8 PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

9 (PEIS)

10 PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

11

12

13 WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2011

14 GOLDFIELD, NEVADA

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

00002

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

2 LINDA J. RESSEGUIE

3 Bureau of Land Management

4

5 JANE SUMMERSON

6 U.S. Department of Energy

7

8 HEIDI M. HARTMANN

9 Argonne National Laboratory

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

00003

1

C O N T E N T S

2

Public Scoping Meeting, 2/16/11

3

4

5 PUBLIC COMMENTS

PAGE

6

Richard Arnold ..... 4

7

Larry Johnson ..... 10

8

Eric Petlock ..... 14

9

Herb Roberts 17

10

Sandra Johnson 19

11

Dominic Pappalardo 20

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

00004

1           P R O C E E D I N G S

2    GOLDFIELD, NEVADA, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2011

3           7:30 P.M.

4

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

18          Richard Arnold from the Pahrump Paiute  
19 Tribe.

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

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

00005

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

00006

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

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

00007

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

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

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

00008

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

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

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



00009

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

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

00010

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

7 MS. RESSEGUIE: And New Mexico.

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

19 MS. RESSEGUIE: Thank you.

20 MS. HARTMANN: State your name.

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

00011

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

00012

1 the locals were not heeded.

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

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

00013

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

3 MS. RESSEGUIE: Okay.

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

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

12 MR. JOHNSON: Caliente.

13 MS. JOHNSON: Caliente.

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

20 MS. RESSEGUIE: Thank you.

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

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

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

00014

1

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

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

25       So in this particular situation here with

00015

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

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

00016

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

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

23           Thank you for your time.

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



00017

1 to make a comment.

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

15 MS. RESSEGUIE: No.

16 MR. ROBERTS: Are you doing both?

17 MS. RESSEGUIE: We are looking at both.

18 MR. ROBERTS: Okay.

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

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

00018

1 MR. SELEY: Yep.

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

10 MS. RESSEGUIE: 20.

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

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

00019

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

25 MS. JOHNSON: A lot of the landscape

00020

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

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

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

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

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

00021

1 meetings?

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

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

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

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

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

00022

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

00023

1 entire salt marsh from mountain to mountain.

2 MR. PAPPALARDO: Oh, really?

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

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

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

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

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

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

00024

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

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

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

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

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

21 MR. SELEY: Right.

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



00025

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

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

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

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

11 MR. PAPPALARDO: Up in the mountains?

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

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

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

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

24 MR. PAPPALARDO: No.

25 MS. RESSEGUIE: But future range plan

00026

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

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

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

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

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

00027

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

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

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

13 MS. RESSEGUIE: Right.

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

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

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

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

25 MR. PETLOCK: Okay.

00028

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

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

13 MS. RESSEGUIE: Yes.

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

18 MS. RESSEGUIE: Crazy about, yeah.

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

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

00029

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

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

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

16 MS. JOHNSON: That's right.

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

19 MS. JOHNSON: That's right.

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

00030

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

4 MS. RESSEGUIE: An application.

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

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

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

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

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

25 MR. PAPPALARDO: Right.

00031

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

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

21 MS. JOHNSON: Exactly.

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

00032

1 is ever started.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

10 we now have a problem with instead of just saying

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

12 you have identified the zones.

13 MR. JOHNSON: Your deadlines, I presume,

14 have been dictated from either the head of BLM,

15 Secretary of the Interior, or maybe higher.

16 MS. RESSEGUIE: You would be right about

17 one of those.

18 MR. JOHNSON: One of the three. This

19 reminds me of the Elko County Forest Service Travel

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

21 public scoping meetings and said, "Our schedule is

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

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

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

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



00033

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

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

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

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

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

00034

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

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

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

12 Sandra?

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

25 I've gone into California and seen all

00035

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

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

14 MS. RESSEGUIE: Eric?

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

00036

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

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

00037

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

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

14 MS. RESSEGUIE: Zones-only.

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

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

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

00038

1 wouldn't even be considered?

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

5 MR. PETLOCK: Okay.

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

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

13 MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

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

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

23 MS. RESSEGUIE: Right.

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

00039

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

3 MR. PAPPALARDO: They're paying us.

4 MR. SELEY: That's right.

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

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

14 MS. RESSEGUIE: Okay. Larry?

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

00040

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

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

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

10 MS. RESSEGUIE: Reintroduce.

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

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

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

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

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



00041

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

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

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

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

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

25 MR. PETLOCK: Okay.

00042

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

00043

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

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

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

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

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

00044

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

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

00045

1 north end. Still want to make it employers.

2 MR. PAPPALARDO: Right.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just a comment. I

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

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

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

7 They're not going to use it.

8 MS. RESSEGUIE: They don't much like

9 towers.

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

11 our RECO project manager and field officer

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

13 standing MOU with Esmeralda County formally with the

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

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

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

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

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

19 probably not wise, problems on other technologies

20 out there.

21 MS. RESSEGUIE: Richard, did you have

22 something?

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

24 statement?

25 MS. RESSEGUIE: Sure.

00046

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

7 MS. RESSEGUIE: That is the goal.

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

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

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

00047

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

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

00048

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

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

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

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



00049

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

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

00050

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

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

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

00051

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

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

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

16 MR. SELEY: 2010, I believe.

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

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

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

00052

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

3 MR. PAPPALARDO: Right.

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

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

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

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

00053

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

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

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

7 MR. PETLOCK: I think I got it.

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

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

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

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

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

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

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: They run for 30  
24 years.

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

00054

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

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

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

20 MR. ROBERTS: Per?

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

00055

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

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

13 MR. ROBERTS: So it all averages.

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

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

21 MS. RESSEGUIE: Yes.

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

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

00056

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



00057

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

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

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

00058

1 STATE OF NEVADA )

2 ) ss:

COUNTY OF CLARK )

3

4 I, Rene' Hannah, Certified Court Reporter,

5 for the State of Nevada do hereby certify:

6 That I reported stenographically the  
7 proceedings had and testimony adduced at the  
8 proceedings held in the foregoing matter on the 16th  
9 day of February, 2011; that my stenotype notes were  
10 later transcribed into type-writing under my  
11 direction, and the foregoing 57 pages contain a true  
12 and complete record of the proceedings had and  
13 testimony adduced at said hearing.

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

16

17

18

---

19 RENE' R. HANNAH, CCR NO. 326

20

21

22

23

24

25