

**Information requested at the Stirling Solar Two meeting in El Centro CA May 6, 2009**

These are follow up questions and comments as requested to be submitted to CEC. I apologize if the answers may be found in Data Responses I have not had time to read.. Edie Harmon

**Bighorn Sheep issues/questions**

Re the photos of **bighorn sheep** (PBHS). What a surprise! At first I thought it was a joke. I have lived here for more than 32 years and would NEVER have expected to see PBHS down on the flat lands however far away from the rocky mountains that seem to be favored habitat and part of designated Critical Habitat. The photos are great, however, they failed to disclose the precise location (GPS) on the approximately 6,500 acre project site. Where were the sheep observed? Did the photographer follow the tracks to see where the sheep had been, where they had come from and later follow tracks to see where the PBHS might have gone? Did following the tracks reveal any information about how long the sheep might have been on the flats, where they had rested or what they ate, or whether they had reached an open water source, and if so how long they might have stayed there? The only two open sources for water that I can think of are the open artificial lakes to the east of Plaster City surrounded by homes and the Westside Main canal by the tamarisk just to the east of Dunaway Road. Other than that there is water leaking from one or more of the US Gypsum wells to the east of Ocotillo. Has anyone seen PBHS in any of those areas? Tracks in the sand should be easy to follow. I know I have an easy time following my own tracks when I hike cross country in the Yuha ACEC and PBHS tracks should be easy to detect because the sheep would be much more likely to break any thin surface “crust” on the flat lands. What does the appearance of the five sheep out on the flats so far from the mountains have to say about what is happening in their preferred habitat? Answers or speculation should be made public so we can all better understand the behavior and habitat implications of the presence of so many animals at a time and place so unexpected? Have Border Patrol agents also observed PBHS in the vicinity where they were photographed? If so when, how many, and how often? Have project biological consultants seen more evidence on the ground of PBHS elsewhere at the proposed project site on tracks leading onto the site crossing the perimeter of the project site? Why did the biologist who took the photo fail to notify US FWS himself? Even if not legally obligated to do so, it seems that as a professional he should have felt a professional obligation to do so.

**Water issues.**

If the needed hydrogen is to come from water that has its origin at the Seeley wastewater treatment facility, what are the energy costs for cleaning up the water further, energy costs for the production of the hydrogen? What is the nature or composition of the residues remaining after the water has been diverted and used for hydrogen production? Where and how will those wastes be disposed of? Would the residue be considered toxic or hazardous waste because of the increased concentration of materials? If so, how would they be disposed of to reduce adverse health impacts? What are the potential environmental impacts downgradient in the New River and south end of the Salton Sea if the wastewater is diverted for the use of SES project? Will there be any potential adverse effects, especially to desert pupfish that may be in the water? Will the removal of that water source together with the reduced cross border wastewater from Mexicali have significant adverse impacts on the Salton Sea and nature of exposed sediments? How might changes in water quality impact aquatic life and avian life using the Salton Sea? With water flow reduces, will the terminus of the New River become more crowded with vegetation and invasive species such as tamarisk? If so, what are appropriate mitigation measures? Would reduced wastewater flow have any impacts on the wildlife refuge at the Sea? If so, mitigation measures?

Follow up questions and comments requested by CEC at May 2009 meeting in El Centro

PROOF OF SERVICE (REVISED 5/26/09 ) FILED WITH  
ORIGINAL MAILED FROM SACRAMENTO ON 5/26/09  
MF

<b>DOCKET</b>	
<b>08-AFC-5</b>	
DATE	<u>MAY 26 2009</u>
RECD.	<u>MAY 26 2009</u>

### **Birds and mirrors issues**

How would the reflections from or visual perceptions/appearance from the field of the curved mirrors appear to birds in flight, be they migratory birds or individuals blown off course or tired from long flights? What if any assurances would there be that the mirrors would not appear as water or patches of water given the many different angles of flight birds might take? Not an unreasonable question given the numbers and variety of migratory birds, waterfowl and shore birds that have stopped inappropriately on the paved Hwy 98 and in the vegetation on the inholding where I live near the Mexican border.

Cormorants, great blue herons, coot, and a variety small shore birds have been rescued from exhaustion along the road or tangled in branches of mesquite trees. Not all survived, but survivors were released at water sources suggested by the BLM wildlife biologist, now an ornithologist with FWS. When I go to Death Valley I always perceive a great large body of water to the NW of Baker, traveling both North and South. However, as we get closer it always turns out to be a mirage. It has been too many years since I studied ornithology to recall if there had been studies on how birds respond to mirages or might respond to large fields of mirrors which are not always in the same orientation to the land. Please cite all the appropriate scientific references and studies. Will use of water to rinse the mirrors and wet mirrors change the visual perceptions of birds and any possible inappropriate responses related to stopping at an inappropriate site. How might the rinse water affect vegetation at the base of installations, thereby changing sources of food and/or seed for birds, mammals, reptiles and lizards. Have the installations been used as perch sites by birds in New Mexico or elsewhere where test units were temporarily installed? Perch sites could mean increased predation on the FTHL, a sensitive species, with management areas both north and south of the proposed site. If so, what are the anticipated cumulative impacts of the project and proposed Sunrise Powerlink. I do not recall if the Sunrise EIR/EIS included cumulative impacts of all the proposed wind and solar energy projects perch sites for predators on the FTHL.

### **Air quality**

There needs to be onsite air quality monitoring both pre project and during project. It is not adequate to cite data from monitoring stations located in El Centro and Calexico many miles to the east. It is imperative to be able to determine the level of particulates generated both by activities at the Plaster City ORV Open Area to the N and NW of the proposed site, and Plaster City US Gypsum factory immediately to the north. Air quality monitoring at distant stations will not be able to disclose the emissions associated with the stationary source (US Gypsum factory) and the ever changing distance and intensity of particulates and GHG from random and high speed ORV use at the Plaster City ORV Open Area, which I assume would be classified as a mobile emission source. If the project is considered for approval, it is imperative that air quality monitoring station be located on or immediately adjacent to the eastern part of the site and that there be some means of differentiating the source of particulates. Air quality impacts related to such large scale disturbance adjacent to other lands which are a significant source of emissions could have potential serious adverse impacts. Also, please note that there have been several recent articles covering concerns about increased incidences of Valley fever with climate change and disturbed desert lands in Arizona. I believe that I raised this issue in scoping concerns earlier.

**Wind Zero and Coyote Wells race course** project cumulative impacts issues were addressed by separate email submissions of project description and comments, including relevant letters from federal agencies with water related concerns. Dust and GHG from any competitive race course which would be immediately south of the SW corner of the proposed SES project site must be addressed both as impacts and cumulative impacts. Ditto for the traffic to and from the Centinela State Prison about 4 miles to the NE of the project site, with access from I-8 along Dunaway Road.



BEFORE THE ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT  
COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
1516 NINTH STREET, SACRAMENTO, CA 95814  
1-800-822-6228 – WWW.ENERGY.CA.GOV

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATION  
For the SES SOLAR TWO PROJECT**

**Docket No. 08-AFC-5**

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

(Revised 5/26/09)

**APPLICANT**

\*Robert B. Liden,  
Executive Vice President  
SES Solar Two, LLC  
4800 North Scottsdale  
Road, Ste. 5500  
Scottsdale, AZ 85251  
[rliden@stirlingenergy.com](mailto:rliden@stirlingenergy.com)

\*Kevin Harper,  
Project Manager  
SES Solar Two, LLC  
4800 North Scottsdale  
Road, Ste. 5500  
Scottsdale, AZ 85251  
[kharp@stirlingenergy.com](mailto:kharp@stirlingenergy.com)

**CONSULTANT**

Angela Leiba, Sr. Project  
Manager URS Corporation  
1615 Murray Canyon Rd.,  
Ste. 1000  
San Diego, CA 92108  
[Angela\\_Leiba@urscorp.com](mailto:Angela_Leiba@urscorp.com)

**APPLICANT'S COUNSEL**

Allan J. Thompson  
Attorney at Law  
21 C Orinda Way #314  
Orinda, CA 94563  
[allanori@comcast.net](mailto:allanori@comcast.net)

**INTERESTED AGENCIES**

California ISO  
[e-recipient@caiso.com](mailto:e-recipient@caiso.com)

Daniel Steward, Project Lead  
BLM – El Centro Office  
1661 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street  
El Centro, CA 92243  
[daniel\\_steward@ca.blm.gov](mailto:daniel_steward@ca.blm.gov)

Jim Stobaugh,  
Project Manager &  
National Project Manager  
Bureau of Land Management  
BLM Nevada State Office  
P.O. Box 12000  
Reno, NV 89520-0006  
[jim\\_stobaugh@blm.gov](mailto:jim_stobaugh@blm.gov)

**INTERVENORS**

CURE  
c/o Tanya A. Gulesserian  
Loulena Miles  
Marc D. Joseph  
Adams Broadwell Joseph  
& Cardozo  
601 Gateway Blvd., Ste. 1000  
South San Francisco,  
CA 94080  
[tgulesserian@adamsbroadwell.com](mailto:tgulesserian@adamsbroadwell.com)  
[lmiles@adamsbroadwell.com](mailto:lmiles@adamsbroadwell.com)

**ENERGY COMMISSION**

JEFFREY D. BYRON  
Commissioner and Presiding  
Member  
[jbyron@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:jbyron@energy.state.ca.us)

JULIA LEVIN  
Commissioner and Associate  
Member  
[jlevin@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:jlevin@energy.state.ca.us)

Raoul Renaud  
Hearing Officer  
[rrenaud@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:rrenaud@energy.state.ca.us)

Caryn Holmes  
Staff Counsel  
[cholmes@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:cholmes@energy.state.ca.us)

Christopher Meyer  
Project Manager  
[cmeyer@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:cmeyer@energy.state.ca.us)

Public Adviser  
[publicadviser@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:publicadviser@energy.state.ca.us)

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

I, Mineka Foggie, declare that May 26, 2009, I served and filed copies of the attached "Public Comments received from Edie Harmon on the May 7th Workshop", dated May 07, 2009. The original document, filed with the Docket Unit, is accompanied by a copy of the most recent Proof of Service list, located on the web page for this project at: [\[www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/solartwo\]](http://www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/solartwo). The document has been sent to both the other parties in this proceeding (as shown on the Proof of Service list) and to the Commission's Docket Unit, in the following manner:

*(Check all that Apply)*

FOR SERVICE TO ALL OTHER PARTIES:

sent electronically to all email addresses on the Proof of Service list;

by personal delivery or by depositing in the United States mail at \_\_\_\_\_ with first-class postage thereon fully prepaid and addressed as provided on the Proof of Service list above to those addresses **NOT** marked "email preferred."

**AND**

FOR FILING WITH THE ENERGY COMMISSION:

sending an original paper copy and one electronic copy, mailed and emailed respectively, to the address below (*preferred method*);

**OR**

depositing in the mail an original and 12 paper copies, as follows:

**OBCALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION**

Attn: Docket No. \_\_\_\_\_

1516 Ninth Street, MS-4

Sacramento, CA 95814-5512

[docket@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:docket@energy.state.ca.us)

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Original Signature in Dockets  
**MINEKA FOGGIE**