ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS L.L.P.

CHRISTOPHER T. ELLISON
ANNE J. SCHNEIDER
JEFFERY D. HARRIS
DOUGLAS K. KERNER
ROBERT E. DONLAN
ANDREW B. BROWN
GREGGORY L. WHEATLAND
CHRISTOPHER M. SANDERS
LYNN M. HAUG
PETER J. KIEL

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

2600 CAPITOL AVENUE, SUITE 400 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95816-5931 TELEPHONE (916) 447-2166 FAX (916) 447-3512 ELIZABETH P. EWENS, OF COUNSEL BRIAN S. BIERING TERESA W. CHAN SHANE E. CONWAY KATHRYN C. COTTER JEDEDIAH J. GIBSON CHASE B. KAPPEL

August 7, 2009

DOCKET07-AFC-5

DATE Aug 07 2009

RECD. Aug 10 2009

John Kessler, Project Manager Ivanpah Solar Project (07-AFC-5) California Energy Commission 1516 Ninth Street Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Kessler:

Thank you for your leadership at the recent Issue Resolution Workshop. The forum was both enlightening and productive. Per the discussion at the workshop, the purpose of this letter is to memorialize the Applicant's position on biological resources mitigation.

As stated during the workshop, regarding Ivanpah Solar Project's overall Biological Resources plan, it is important to distinguish between: (1) what the law requires, and (2) what additional measures the Applicant may be willing to agree to contribute towards California's environmental interests and in order to resolve the issues related to biological mitigation. The following discussion reflects the settlement framework we first presented to CDFG and the Resources Agency in December of 2008.

On federal Endangered Species Act ("ESA") issues, the law is clear. The project has certain mitigation obligations under the federal ESA. Those mitigation obligations are implemented by the BLM through its fee programs and the inclusion of certain project-specific mitigation measures, such as desert tortoise fencing, relocation and translocation protocols and alike.

On California ESA ("CESA") issues, the law is also clear. Significantly, there are no substantive differences between ESA mitigation and CESA "full mitigation." California case law supports this conclusion.

On all non-CESA state law issues, commonly referred to as California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") issues, we will of course do what the law requires. This will include compliance with applicable provisions related to streambed crossing and rare plants. But again, what is legally required on these non-CESA issues is much less than what some have suggested. The Applicant is willing to contribute more than is legally required, but the Commission and all concerned must recognize that putting too much economic burden on renewable energy projects will cause them—and both the California RPS program and its ambitious climate objectives – to

fail. Current discussions on adopting a 33% RPS program have focused sharply on costs, including the 33% RPS analysis performed by the Public Utilities Commission, to which the Energy Commission contributed. It is not in any of the State's environmental interests, including desert ecosystem concerns, to slow or stop the displacement of conventional energy with renewable resources.

The attached Table 1, entitled "Legal Requirements," is a summary of the Applicant's mitigation obligations under California and federal law.

While what the law requires is clear, the Applicant has also prepared a proposal aimed at contributing more than what is legally required to contribute towards California's environment and to resolve these issues. The Applicant has made clear; it is the Applicant and its parent company's policies to go beyond the minimum that the law requires. In accordance with this direction, we have prepared the attached Table 2, entitled "Applicant's Comprehensive Settlement Proposal."

The Applicant's Comprehensive Settlement Proposal greatly exceeds the mitigation required by the BLM, which is the only mitigation required in other neighboring Western States and, in combination with the funds to be provided to CDFG and for tortoise education, compensates at a ratio greater than 3:1 at the BLM in-lieu fee rates.

The BLM's 1:1 mitigation is consistent with the recommendations in the Final EIS for the Northern and Eastern Mojave Desert Management Plan (the "NEMO"). The additional 2:1 mitigation funds could be given to CDFG to be used for any additional mitigation CDFG seeks on CESA and non-CESA issues. Any remaining monies could serve as seed money for the Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan ("DRECP"), which is in development.

The Applicant's Comprehensive Settlement Proposal is intended to allow the parties to "agree to disagree" while still reaching a successful outcome in this permitting proceeding. The Applicant believes the its proposed mitigation package goes well beyond satisfying all applicable legal requirements, and it establishes sound precedent for future projects.

Again, thank you for your help in bringing the parties together to discuss these important issues.

Sincerely,

Ellison, Schneider & Harris L.L.P.

Jeffery D. Harris

Attorneys for the Applicant

IVANPAH SOLAR PROJECT MITIGATION PACKAGE WHAT THE LAW REQUIRES

TABLE 1

FEDERAL MITIGATION					
Desert Tortoise					
BLM mitigation fees: 4,060 acre project site	Mitigation Fees	ENFORCEMENT VEHICLE			
BLM Mitigation Fees: (1) BLM Management Fee	(BLM Mitigation Fees) X	Right-of-way grant condition			
plus (2) Land Acquisition Fee ¹	(4,060 acres) X (1:1 ratio)	Monies to be used by BLM for project			
Ratio: One-to-one		mitigation.			
CALIFORNIA MITIGATION					
CESA "full mitigation" and non-CESA mitigation ¹	Satisfied by the federal	Satisfied by the federal mitigation			
	mitigation				

^{1:} In addition to the land mitigation fees, additional administration fees may be required per BLM regulations.

IVANPAH SOLAR PROJECT APPLICANT'S COMPREHENSIVE SETTLEMENT PROPOSAL

TABLE 2

FEDERAL MITIGATION					
Desert Tortoise					
BLM Mitigation Fees: 4,060 acre project site	Mitigation Fees	ENFORCEMENT VEHICLE			
BLM mitigation fees: (1) BLM management fee	(BLM mitigation fees) X	Right-of-way grant condition			
plus (2) land acquisition fee ¹	(4,060 acres) X (1:1 ratio)	Monies to be used by BLM for project			
Ratio: One-to-one		mitigation.			
CALIFORNIA MITIGATION					
CESA "full mitigation" and non-CESA mitigation ¹	(BLM mitigation fees) X	Surety bond agreement (due upon			
	(4,060 acres) X (2:1 ratio)	commencement of construction)			
Ratio: Two-to-one					
		Monies to be used by CDFG for activities			
		deemed necessary by CDFG: (1) for CESA,			
		and (2) for non-CESA biological resources			
		[rare plants, streambeds, etc.]. Any remaining			
		funds to be used as "seed money" for DRECP			
Destruction Continues For the (Fortermon)	A	programs.			
Restoration Contingency Funding (Endowment)	An amount equal to the BLM Site Restoration	CEC Condition of Certification			
Under existing law, the Ivanpah Solar Project has an obligation to					
restore the site and revegetate at the end of the BLM right-of-way	bonding requirements, per BLM's Right of Way				
grant. If at a later date via Act of Congress the project's restoration	Regulations, as determined				
obligations are removed, then the land will be permanently removed as potential habitat. Under an agreed to CEC Condition of	by BLM upon issuance of				
Certification, if the Ivanpah Solar Project is relieved of its land	the Right of Way grant				
restoration obligations, then and only then, the Restoration Contingency Fund will be due and owing.	une reight of way grant				
Desert Tortoise Education Activities	\$250,000	Agreement between Ivanpah Solar Project			
	7-2 3,3 3 3	and an appropriate non-governmental			
		organization (NGO)			
Notes: Federal and California Mitigation equals a 3:1 ratio. The Desert Tortoise Education Activities funding represents the					

Notes: Federal and California Mitigation equals a 3:1 ratio. The Desert Tortoise Education Activities funding represents the Ivanpah Solar Project's commitment to fund these activities, and was not requested by CDFG or BLM.

^{1:} In addition to the land mitigation fees, additional administration fees may be required per BLM regulations and the CDFG's surety bond provisions.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission

Application for Certification for the IVANPAH)	
SOLAR ELECTRIC GENERATING SYSTEM)	Docket No. 07-AFC-5
)	
)	

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Karen A. Mitchell, declare that on August 7, 2009, I served the attached *Letter dated*August 7, 2009 to John Kessler regarding Biological Resources Mitigation via electronic mail and United States Mail to all parties on the attached service list.

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

Karen A. Mitchell

Karen G. Mutchell



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 IVANPAH SOLAR ELECTRIC
GENERATING SYSTEM

DOCKET NO. 07-AFC-5 PROOF OF SERVICE (Revised 7/2/09)

APPLICANT.

Solar Partners, LLC John Woolard, Chief Executive Officer 1999 Harrison Street, Suite #500 Oakland, CA 94612

Todd A. Stewart, Project Manager Ivanpah SEGS

sdeyoung@brightsourceenergy.com

E-mail Preferred

Steve De Young, Project Manager Ivanpah SEGS.
1999 Harrison Street, Ste. 2150
Oakland, CA 94612
tstewart@brightsourceenergy.com

APPLICANT'S CONSULTANTS

John L. Carrier, J. D. 2485 Natomas Park Dr. #600 Sacramento, CA 95833-2937 jcarrier@ch2m.com

COUNSEL FOR APPLICANT

Jeffery D. Harris Ellison, Schneider & Harris L.L.P. 2600 Capitol Avenue, Ste. 400 Sacramento, CA 95816-5905 idh@eslawfirm.com

INTERESTED AGENCIES

California ISO <u>e-recipient@caiso.com</u>

Tom Hurshman,
Project Manager
Bureau of Land Management
2465 South Townsend Ave.
Montrose, CO 81401
tom_hurshman@blm.gov

Sterling White, Field Manager Bureau of Land Management 1303 South Highway 95 Needles, CA 92363 sterling_white@blm.gov

Becky Jones
California Department of
Fish & Game
36431 41st Street East
Palmdale, CA 93552
dfgpalm@adelphia.net

INTERVENORS

California Unions for Reliable Energy ("CURE")
Tanya A. Gulesserian
Marc D. Joseph
Adams Broadwell Joseph & Cardozo
601 Gateway Boulevard, Ste 1000
South San Francisco, CA 94080
tgulesserian@adamsbroadwell.com

Western Watersheds Project Michael J. Connor, Ph.D. P.O. Box 2364 Reseda, CA 91337-2364 mjconnor@westernwatersheds.org

Gloria Smith, Joanne Spalding Sidney Silliman, Sierra Club 85 Second Street, 2nd Fl. San Francisco, CA 94105 gloria.smith@sierraclub.org joanne.spalding@sierraclub.org gssilliman@csupomona.edu E-mail Preferred

INTERVENORS CONT.

Joshua Basofin, CA Rep. Defenders of Wildlife 1303 J Street, Ste. 270 Sacramento, CA 95814 jbasofin@defenders.org E-mail Preferred

*Basin and Range Watch Laura Cunningham Kevin Emmerich P.O. Box 70 Beatty, NV 89003 atomictoadranch@netzero.net

*Center for Biological Diversity
Lisa T. Belenky, Sr. Attorney
Ileene Anderson, Public Lands Desert Director
351 California Street, Ste. 600
San Francisco, CA 94104
E-mail Preferred
Ibelenky@biologicaldiversity.org
ianderson@biologicaldiversity.org

ENERGY COMMISSION

JEFFREY D. BYRON Commissioner and Presiding Member jbyron@energy.state.ca.us

JAMES D. BOYD Vice Chairman and Associate Member jboyd@energy.state.ca.us

Paul Kramer Hearing Officer pkramer@energy.state.ca.us

John Kessler Project Manager jkessler@energy.state.ca.us

Dick Ratliff
Staff Counsel dratliff@energy.state.ca.us

Elena Miller
Public Adviser
publicadviser@energy.state.ca.us