

**From:** Mike Monasmith  
**To:** Docket Optical System  
**Date:** 1/6/2011 10:25 AM  
**Subject:** Fwd: NPS Input to CEC Siting Committee's "Lessons Learned"

**DOCKET****10-SIT-OII-1**

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

RECD. JAN 06 2011

Hello,

Please docket this email for the 10-SIT OII-1 "Lessons Learned" proceeding? Please let me know if you need me to print a paper copy of this email and complete a blue sheet, or not?

Thanks for all your support,

Mike

Mike Monasmith  
Senior Project Manager  
California Energy Commission  
1516 9th Street, MS 15  
Sacramento, CA 95814

PLEASE NOTE: This email and any attachments are confidential. If you receive this message in error or are not the intended recipient, you should not view, retain, distribute, disclose or use any of this information and immediately destroy the email and all attachments.

>>> <[Carol\\_McCoy@nps.gov](mailto:Carol_McCoy@nps.gov)> 1/3/2011 6:11 PM >>>

Hi Mike---

The National Park Service (NPS) participated in the review process of the various ARRA fast track projects within the Department of the Interior.

We learned several lessons, key among them being 1) the need for early engagement of the NPS at the pre-permitting stage, and 2) the need for companies and permitting agencies to be aware of the need to safeguard units of our nation's National Park System in deciding where to site and permit facilities. We ask that criteria be added to the CEC's decision-making process that screens out projects that could cause adverse impacts to the resources and values of adjacent national park units and other special areas, like our national scenic and historic trails. Unless thoughtfully sited, renewable energy power plants can adversely impact park wildlife, water resources, night skies, soundscapes, air quality, cultural resources, and scenic views from parks.

From the list presented in the CEC memo to interested parties dated 12/3/10, our top 5 priorities for consideration in addressing lessons learned are 1 and 2 above plus the following:  
#3--visual, recreation, and open space issues  
#4--cumulative impact analyses (they need to be robust)  
#5--alternatives analyses (they need to be broadened to include alternative sites beyond the one identified by an applicant; perhaps applicants can be tasked with identifying several sites that would be appropriate for the technology they wish to deploy)

Finally, we trust that the CEC has the benefit of the survey conducted on "lessons learned" by the Aspen Environmental Group on behalf of the REAT-REPG. The NPS provided input to that survey back in November.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input. We look forward to working with the CEC and others to transform our nation's energy portfolio in a way that also safeguards our national parks and other special places.

Carol

---

Carol McCoy  
Chief--Planning, Evaluation and Permits Branch  
Geologic Resources Division  
Natural Resource Program Center  
National Park Service  
w-303/969-2096; fax-303/987-6792  
carol \_ [mccoy@nps.gov](mailto:mccoy@nps.gov)