

# Memorandum

**Date:** October 26, 2011  
**Telephone:** (916) 654-4894  
**File:** 11-AFC-2

**To:** Commissioner Karen Douglas, Presiding Member  
Commissioner Carla Peterman, Associate Member  
Hearing Officer Kenneth Celli

**From:** California Energy Commission - Mike Monasmith  
1516 Ninth Street Senior Project Manager  
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512

**DOCKET****11-AFC-2**

DATE OCT 26 2011

RECD. OCT 26 2011

**Subject:** HIDDEN HILLS SOLAR ELECTRIC GENERATING SYSTEM (11-AFC-2)  
ISSUES IDENTIFICATION REPORT

Attached is staff's Issues Identification Report for the Hidden Hills Solar Electric Generating System. This report serves as a preliminary scoping document that identifies issues that Energy Commission staff believes will require careful attention and consideration. Energy Commission staff will discuss the issues identified in this report at the November 3, 2011 Informational Hearing and Site Visit.

This Issues Identification Report also provides a proposed schedule for the Committee's consideration, with tentative dates for key proceeding events proposed by both Staff and the Applicant.

cc: Proof of Service List  
Docket 11-AFC-2

**HIDDEN HILLS SOLAR ELECTRIC  
GENERATING SYSTEM**

**(11-AFC-2)**

**ISSUES IDENTIFICATION REPORT**

**CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION**

**Siting, Transmission and Environmental Protection Division**

# **ISSUES IDENTIFICATION REPORT HIDDEN HILLS SOLAR ELECTRIC GENERATING SYSTEM**

(11-AFC-2)

## **Table of Contents**

<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>POTENTIAL MAJOR ISSUES.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>ALTERNATIVES.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>LAND USE.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>SOCIOECONOMICS.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>TRANSMISSION SYSTEM ENGINEERING.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>VISUAL RESOURCES.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>WATER RESOURCES.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>SCHEDULE.....</b>	<b>9</b>

# **ISSUES IDENTIFICATION REPORT**

## **Energy Commission Staff Report**

### **PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

---

This report has been prepared by the California Energy Commission staff to inform the Committee and all interested parties of the potential issues that have been identified in the Hidden Hills proceeding thus far. These issues have been identified as a result of our discussions with federal, state, and local agencies, and our review of the Hidden Hills Solar Electric Generating System Application for Certification (AFC), filed August 5, 2011, and AFC Supplemental material filed on September 9 and 23, 2011. This Issues Identification Report contains a project description, summary of potentially significant environmental and engineering issues, and a discussion of the proposed project schedule. The staff will continue to address the status of issues and progress towards their resolution via periodic Status Reports provided to the Committee.

### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

---

The Hidden Hills Solar Electric Generating System (HHSEGS) will be located on approximately 3,277 acres of privately-owned land leased in Inyo County, California, immediately adjacent to the Nevada border. The project site is approximately 8 miles south of Pahrump, Nevada, and approximately 45 miles west of Las Vegas, Nevada.

HHSEGS will comprise two solar fields and associated facilities: the northern solar plant (Solar Plant 1) and the southern solar plant (Solar Plant 2). Each solar plant will generate 250 megawatts (MW), for a total net output of 500 MW. Solar Plant 1 will occupy approximately 1,483 acres (or 2.3 square miles), and Solar Plant 2 will occupy approximately 1,510 acres (or 2.4 square miles). Each solar plant will use heliostats—elevated mirrors guided by a tracking system mounted on a pylon—to focus the sun's rays on a solar receiver steam generator (SRSG) atop a 750-foot tall solar power tower near the center of each solar field. Each plant will consist of the following elements:

- One heliostat array with about 85,000 heliostats;
- A power block containing a Rankine-cycle non-reheat steam turbine, SRSG, feed water heaters, a deaerator, an emergency diesel generator, and a diesel fire pump;
- Five natural-gas-fired boilers, ranging in size from 1.2 MW to 50 MW;
- An air-cooled condenser to minimize water use in the desert environment; and,
- Access roads and drive zones will also be developed on the project site to facilitate operations and maintenance activities, emergency access, and site security.

## **TRANSMISSION**

The transmission and natural gas pipeline alignments will be located in Nevada, primarily on federal land managed by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM), except for one small segment of the transmission line between HHSEGS and the Nevada border, and another in the vicinity of the Eldorado Substation in Boulder City, Nevada. A detailed environmental impact analysis of the transmission and natural gas pipeline alignments will be prepared by Nevada BLM.

## **WATER USE**

HHSEGS will utilize six, onsite groundwater supply wells that will be drilled and developed to provide raw, process water for electrical generation purposes; two new wells per power block (primary and backup) and two wells at the common administration complex shared by both plants. The combined total annual water usage is estimated to be 140 acre feet/year.

If approved, construction of HHSEGS' Solar Plant 1 and Solar Plant 2 is expected to last 29 months, with site preparation expected to commence in the third quarter of 2012. Commercial operation is expected to begin for Solar Plant 1 in the first quarter of 2015, and Solar Plant 2 commercial operation is expected to begin the second quarter of 2015.

## **POTENTIAL MAJOR ISSUES**

---

This portion of the report contains a discussion of the potential issues the Energy Commission staff has identified to date. The Committee should be aware that this report might not include all of the significant issues that may arise during this proceeding. The discovery phase of the proceeding has just commenced (as of October 5, 2011), and other parties and members of the public have not yet had an opportunity to identify their concerns or raise issues for staff to investigate and resolve. The identification of the potential issues contained in this report is based on comments of other government agencies and on Staff's independent analysis and judgment regarding whether any of the following circumstances could occur:

- Potential significant impacts which may be difficult to mitigate;
- Potential areas of non-compliance with applicable laws, ordinances, regulations or standards (LORS); and,
- Areas of conflict or potential conflict between the parties for which resolution may be difficult to achieve with resulting schedule delays.

This report will not limit the scope of staff's analysis throughout this proceeding, but it helps guide the initial areas of analyses regarding potentially significant issues that the HHSEGS proposal poses. The following discussion summarizes the potential issues and where applicable, identifies the parties needed to resolve the issues.

The table below lists all the subject areas evaluated and notes that Biological, Cultural, Visual and Water Resources have been identified as potentially significant issues. However, because discovery is not yet complete, it is possible that other significant issues will arise. The table also indicates the subject areas in which staff has issued data requests. Data requests in additional areas may become necessary as the case progresses.

Major Issue	DRs	Subject Area	Major Issue	DRs	Subject Area
No	Yes	Air Quality	No	No	Public Health
Yes	Yes	Alternatives	No	No	Reliability
Yes	Yes	Biological Resources	Yes	Yes	Socioeconomics
Yes	Yes	Cultural Resources	No	Yes	Soils
No	No	Efficiency	Yes	Yes	Water Resources
No	No	Facility Design	No	Yes	Traffic and Transportation
No	No	Geological Hazards	No	No	Trans. Line Safety & Nuisance
No	No	Hazardous Materials Management	Yes	No	Transmission System Engineering
Yes	Yes	Land Use	Yes	Yes	Visual Resources
No	No	Noise	No	Yes	Waste Management
No	No	Paleontological Resources	No	Yes	Worker Safety

## ALTERNATIVES

The alternatives analysis prepared by BrightSource Energy and submitted in their Hidden Hills Application for Certification (AFC) discusses eight alternative sites and a No-Project Alternative. AFC Section 6.2, "Site Alternatives Considered," states that, "all of the alternative sites considered are located within Renewable Energy Land Use Designation Overlay Zones as designated in the Inyo County Solar and Wind Renewable Energy General Plan Amendment (REGPA)..." On September 6, 2011, Inyo County rescinded the general plan amendment that had established the overlay zones.

Given that the project alternatives analyzed in the AFC are limited to just those located within the REGPA, it is clear that no alternative sites outside of the overlay zones were reviewed or considered by the applicant. Therefore, because the geographic scope of the alternatives analysis in the AFC is limited to study areas identified by Inyo County as suitable for renewable energy development, Energy Commission staff is concerned that other potential alternative sites have not yet been identified which could avoid or lessen potentially significant effects of the proposed HHSEGS project. Energy Commission staff will confer with the project applicant, Inyo County staff, and other agencies and organizations, as appropriate, to understand and investigate what other alternative sites could be worthy of consideration and analysis.

## BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

---

The HHSEGS project site is located in Pahrump Valley, in the eastern Mojave Desert. Habitat onsite is primarily Mojave desert scrub and shadscale scrub, providing habitat for a variety of resident species, including the federally and state listed desert tortoise. Development of the project would result in the loss of approximately 3,200 acres of native desert scrub habitat and ephemeral washes. Review of HHSEGS' biological impacts will involve close coordination with resource agencies from both California and Nevada, including the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) to assess potential project impacts to sensitive habitats and species. Staff conducted a public Workshop on October 21, 2011 focused on biological resources, and staff will continue to work closely with CDFG, USFWS, BLM and the applicant in the development of the CDFG Streambed Alteration Agreement and Incidental Take Permit (which will be issued through the Energy Commission's in-lieu permitting authority for state permits), as well as the federal Section 7 consultation to address potential impacts to listed species. Given the scope of biological resource analyses, staff plans to conduct frequent publically-noticed workshops to identify and quickly resolve biological resources issues that might otherwise delay preparation of permits and the Staff Assessment.

Potentially Significant Biological Resources Impact Areas for this project include:

- loss of desert tortoise habitat and individuals;
- need to relocate desert tortoise onto agency-approved translocation lands, necessitating pre-translocation density surveys and disease testing on tortoise recipient sites;
- unknown effects of large solar power towers on migratory birds and bat species in the project area and development of a mitigation plan;
- impacts and mitigation for state waters under Section 1600 of California Fish and Game code;
- impacts to golden eagle territories, eagle foraging habitat, and potential migration pathways;
- impacts to Nelson's bighorn sheep foraging habitat values; and
- impacts to eight special-status plants species identified on-site during focused botanical surveys conducted by the applicant, some occurring in very large densities throughout the project site including the identification of another plant species, Nye milk-vetch, which has never been found occurring in California before;
- potential scheduling effects related to Federal permit requirements. Federal permits the applicant must complete are currently identified to be: Endangered Species Act (ESA) Section 10(a)(1)(a) research permit for pre-project desert tortoise blood work and monitoring, ESA Section 7 incidental take permit for desert tortoise, Clean Water Act Section 404 permit for waters of the U.S., and

- need to complete the following plant and wildlife surveys: Anabat™ surveys, golden eagle surveys, phase III of burrowing owl surveys, migratory bird point counts, and general biological surveys and focused plant surveys within the recently added “Common Area” portion of the project.

Presently, staff is working with the resource agencies on developing data requests for these primary issue areas and indicating to the applicant which issue areas need more supportive environmental baseline data. Staff will then prepare an independent analysis of the project's impacts and the project's contribution to potentially significant impacts to these sensitive resources. Staff will continue to work closely and diligently with the applicant and resource agencies on the development of impact avoidance and minimization measures, mitigation plans, and ultimately a compensatory habitat mitigation proposal to reduce the project's impacts to species and their habitat to less than significant levels.

## **CULTURAL RESOURCES**

---

Staff is working diligently to establish the extent of resources of cultural and historical significance, and to assess potential HHSEGS project impacts upon these resources. Staff is working with the Nevada BLM, representatives of local Native American communities, and the applicant to determine reasonably foreseeable project impacts, inventory surveys, and justified levels of mitigation based on significance assumptions that will ultimately provide appropriate and timely, discovery and analysis. Staff has commenced early tribal outreach meetings with local Native American constituencies. Staff has had productive discussions with the Pahrump Paiute and Las Vegas Paiute Tribes. This Native American consultation is ongoing, and ethnographic resource conflicts could arise later in the licensing process which could in turn impact the schedule.

## **LAND USE**

---

In April 2011, the Inyo County Board of Supervisors adopted a Renewable Solar and Wind Energy General Plan Amendment (REGPA) that established several "Renewable Energy Land Use Designation Overlay Zones", including a renewable zone (Charleston View) encompassing the site of the proposed HHSEGS project. The REGPA provided the basis for approvals of solar or wind renewable energy facilities and established policies to encourage development of renewable energy in overlay zones in any zoning district under Title 18 and Title 21 of the Inyo County Code.

On September 6, 2011, the Inyo County Board of Supervisors rescinded the County's REGPA because of a legal challenge from the Sierra Club and the Center for Biological Diversity. The County's action effectively eliminated the overlay zone and caused the proposed HHSEGS project to be inconsistent with Inyo County's land use designation



and zoning district for the project site (General plan designation of Open Space and Recreation, Open Space 40-acre minimum zoning).

Staff's Preliminary Staff Assessment (PSA) for land use will indicate HHSEGS's inconsistency with the Inyo County General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. This inconsistency could result in a significant impact determination for Land Use (Appendix G checklist in the CEQA Guidelines). Staff will continue to work with Inyo County to determine what requirements the County would impose on the HHSEGS project, were they the permitting agency.

## **SOCIOECONOMICS**

---

The HHSEGS project site is within the jurisdiction of the Inyo County Sheriff's Department, which has one sheriff station (#15) located on Highway 127 in the town of Shoshone. According to the AFC, the response time for officers on patrol or on call in the service area ranges between 0.5 hour to 3 hours. Energy Commission staff reviewed the Inyo County General Plan and did not find any minimum response time or other performance standard for law enforcement services. The remote location of the project site, the limited resources of the Inyo County Sheriff's Department, and the estimated response time to the project site are of particular concern to staff. The AFC notes that the applicant is working with the Inyo County Sheriff's office to understand their requirements and reduce any impacts.

The project site is within the Southern Inyo Fire Protection District (SIFPD) jurisdiction, which has limited emergency medical response resources, as SIFPD staff is mostly volunteer. There is one station in the town of Tecopa and a temporary location in the area known locally as Charleston View. SIFPD has mutual aid agreements with Pahrump Valley Fire-Rescue Service (PVFRS) and Round Mountain/Smoky Valley Fire Services and additional county resources as part Nye County Emergency Services (NCES). SIFPD also has mutual aid agreements with Clark County (Las Vegas, Nevada) for responses requiring more assistance. The AFC notes that the applicant is working with the SIFPD to understand their requirements and reduce any impacts.

Energy Commission staff has concerns about the ability of the law enforcement and emergency medical response providers to respond to calls at the project site. The project's remote location and the limited resources of these service providers could combine to make a timely response difficult. At this time, staff has not received responses to its data requests submitted to the applicant, nor has staff received responses from the Inyo County Sheriff's Department or Southern Inyo Fire Protection District that would provide the information needed to assess possible impacts to law enforcement and emergency medical response services in Inyo County. Energy Commission staff will continue to work with the Inyo County Sheriff's Department, the Southern Inyo Fire Protection District, other county staff, and the applicant to resolve these issues.

## **TRANSMISSION SYSTEM ENGINEERING**

---

The California Independent System Operator (CAISO) has not yet performed the transmission system impact analysis that will describe reinforcement work or system additions that would be required by the HHSEGS project. Until this analysis is performed, or such impacts are otherwise identified, staff cannot determine the extent of such transmission impacts, nor analyze any resulting environmental consequences.

## **VISUAL RESOURCES**

---

Staff is concerned about potential significant visual effects on views of the greater Pahrump Valley. These concerns are from the perspective of motorists, Native Americans, recreationists and local residents. The primary impact would be from the two 750-foot tall Solar Power Towers/Solar Receiver Steam Generators, their dominance in the landscape and the potential to produce a significant amount of glint and glare. While there are no scenic highways or byways identified in the project vicinity, views from the Nopah Range and Pahrump Valley Wilderness Areas would be affected, as would views from the Historic Old Spanish Trail – all areas within California. In Nevada, it is not clear if views from the Spring Mountains National Recreation Area or from the Mount Charleston Wilderness within the Spring Mountains would be affected due to topography. Views of Mount Charleston from various vista points in California may also be significantly impacted by the project. The potentially significant visual impacts of the project are likely unmitigable due to the height of the proposed towers.

Further visual concerns have been identified by owners of the Tecopa Hot Springs Resort regarding the potential for the proposed facility to impact their resort as a destination for dark sky advocates and tourists. Staff has concerns that the project's security and operational lighting, even with lighting controls as mitigation, combined with the cumulative effects of nighttime lighting as the Pahrump Valley develops, could cause an unmitigable effect on dark skies and dark sky tourism in the region.

## **WATER RESOURCES**

---

The applicant proposes to meet HHSEGS project needs with groundwater from the Pahrump Valley groundwater basin. The project would require up to 288 acre-feet per year (AFY) for project construction and 140AFY for operation. The Pahrump Valley groundwater basin is currently in severe overdraft. Absent project effects, basin water levels directly beneath the proposed site could fall approximately 20 feet over the next 30 years from existing agricultural and domestic uses. Superimposed project pumping could result in a potential water level drop of up to 50 feet of total drawdown at the project site over the next 30 years.

Preliminary review of the AFC and supporting documentation indicates the additional proposed project pumping could also result in significant impacts to other users in the

basin. The impacts would occur in the form of local drawdown effects on adjacent well owners and an ongoing reduction in basin storage.

Both California and Nevada residents share the Pahrump Valley groundwater basin. Settlement and water use in the basin has occurred primarily on the Nevada side of the basin. Many of the water rights in the Nevada side of the basin were established prior to implementation of Nevada's statewide groundwater water rights system, which now stipulates land owners acquire water use permits prior to pumping. Domestic users do not require water rights and therefore, total basin demand is not accurately described by quantified water rights. Furthermore, a significant portion of the water rights in the Pahrump Valley are not currently being exercised. Nevada has established a safe yield for the Pahrump groundwater basin of about 12,000 AFY. The current pumping of the basin far exceeds this safe yield.

California generally does not regulate the use of underground water. In California, with exceptions that do not apply here, overlying landowners have the right to install wells and pump groundwater for reasonable and beneficial uses. Preliminary review of available information shows there is little to no groundwater data available for the California side of the basin, in comparison to data from the Nevada portion of the basin.

To mitigate impacts, the Hidden Hills project owner proposes to secure water rights of up to 400 AFY for the life of the project through purchase from existing water rights holders in Nevada. The availability of water rights that could be retired and thus be used to offset project water use is unclear. The terms of the water rights purchases and how much water use they would actually retire may also be difficult to resolve and could put in question the viability of the proposed mitigation. Opportunities to offset project water use and reduce the project's contribution to overdraft may exist on either side of the state line. The potential for offset is far more likely to be available in Nevada given the current higher water use and system of water rights in Nevada, and lack of groundwater management in California. Agricultural land-use retirement may be a source of water use mitigation in both California and Nevada.

Data for characterization of the Pahrump Valley groundwater basin is limited. Staff will continue to research the availability of water use and basin data for both the California and Nevada side of the Pahrump Valley groundwater basin. Additional analysis could lead to additional or alternative mitigation measures not currently considered or defined. The ongoing interstate and proposed project impacts, lack of data, and potential for mitigation could potentially affect the schedule to complete the water analysis.

## PROJECT SCHEDULE

---

On the following page is staff's proposed 12-month schedule for this proceeding. At the October 21, 2011 Staff Workshop on Air Quality and Biological Resources held in Sacramento, applicant and staff conferred on key aspects of the 12-month schedule, including dates. The following schedule reflects the October 21<sup>st</sup> Workshop discussion, and indicates general agreement between applicant and staff on most proceeding dates, with the exception of Committee-scheduled events like Evidentiary Hearings and publication of the PMPD, where staff did not contemplate possible dates in 2012.

As is always the case, meeting the proposed schedule will depend upon a number of factors, including: the applicant's timely response to staff's data requests; involvement and timely input by other local, state and federal agencies; the submittal of required applications and approval of permits by federal agencies; and, other factors not yet known or expected, like project changes. The approval of applications and conditions of approval by other agencies will also greatly affect the proposed schedule. This is particularly true of the Section 7 consultation by the Bureau of Land Management (Nevada) with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (California) regarding potential impacts to federally listed sensitive species, such as desert tortoise, and related mitigation options.

## STAFF'S PROPOSED SCHEDULE – Hidden Hills SEGS - (01-AFC-2)

	ACTIVITY	Staff's Proposed Schedule	Applicant's Proposed Schedule
1	AFC filed	08-05-11	08-05-11
2	AFC Data Adequacy determination at Commission Business Meeting	10-05-11	10-05-11
3	Staff files Data Requests (round 1A)	10-17-11	10-17-11
4	Data Request Workshop (in Sacramento)	10-21-11	10-21-11
5	Staff files Data Requests (round 1B)	10-26-11	10-26-11
6	Staff files Issues ID Report	10-26-11	10-26-11
7	Pre-site visit staff visit to Inyo County + Workshop (in Tecopa, CA)	10-27-11	10-27-11
8	Information Hearing and Site Visit (in Tecopa, CA)	11-03-11	11-03-11
9	Staff files Data Requests (round 1C)	11-09-11	11-09-11
10	Applicant files Data Responses (round 1A)	11-16-11	11-16-11
11	Data Response and Issues Resolution Workshop (in Sacramento)	11-17-11	11-17-11
12	Staff files data requests (round 2)- visual resources	12-06-11	12-06-11
13	Applicant provides data responses (round 2)	01-05-12	01-05-11
14	Data Response (round 2) and Issue Resolution Workshop	01-11-12	01-11-12
15	Preliminary Staff Assessment filed	02-29-12	02-29-12
16	Preliminary Staff Assessment workshop (in Inyo County)	03-15-12	03-15-12
17	APCD issues Preliminary Determination of Compliance (PDOC)	TBD	03-09-12
18	Public Comments on PSA are due	03-30-12	03-30-12
19	Final Staff Assessment filed	05-02-12	04-25-12
20	Final Staff Assessment Workshop (if necessary)	05-15-12	Optional TBD <sup>1</sup>
21	APCD issues Final Determination of Compliance (FDOC)	TBD	05-08-12
22	Prehearing Conference*	TBD	05-16-12
23	Evidentiary Hearings*	TBD	05-23-12
24	Committee files Presiding Member's Proposed Decision*	TBD	07-27-12
25	Hearing on the PMPD*	TBD	08-13-12
26	Committee files errata to PMPD (if necessary)*	TBD	09-03-12
27	Commission issues final Decision*	TBD	09-12-12 <sup>2</sup>
<b>*Items 22 thru 27 are scheduled by the Committee</b>			

<sup>1</sup> Applicant believes that a FSA workshop is unnecessary, given that the FSA represents Staff's pre-filed testimony. However, Applicant would not object to such a workshop so long as it does not result in delaying the remaining schedule such that a Final Decision could not be issued within the Commission's statutory one-year deadline.

<sup>2</sup> Given that the Commission will meet only once a month in calendar year 2012, a decision at the September 12, 2012 Business Meeting is necessary to meet the statutory one-year deadline. Furthermore, this Decision date is necessary to ensure that desert tortoise clearance can be completed during the desert tortoise clearance window to allow construction to commence in the Fall of 2012.



**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 *HIDDEN HILLS SOLAR ELECTRIC  
GENERATING SYSTEM PROJECT***

DOCKET NO. 11-AFC-2  
PROOF OF SERVICE

APPLICANT

Stephen Wiley  
BrightSource Energy  
1999 Harrison Street, Suite 2150  
Oakland, CA 94612-3500  
[swiley@brightsourceenergy.com](mailto:swiley@brightsourceenergy.com)

Steve DeYoung  
Jill Young  
Andrew Miller  
BrightSource Energy  
1999 Harrison Street, Suite 2150  
Oakland, CA 94612-3500  
[sdeyoung@brightsourceenergy.com](mailto:sdeyoung@brightsourceenergy.com)  
[jyoung@brightsourceenergy.com](mailto:jyoung@brightsourceenergy.com)  
[amiller@brightsourceenergy.com](mailto:amiller@brightsourceenergy.com)

Clay Jensen  
BrightSource Energy  
410 South Rampart Blvd., Suite 390  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89145  
[cjensen@brightsourceenergy.com](mailto:cjensen@brightsourceenergy.com)

APPLICANT'S CONSULTANTS

Susan Strachan  
Strachan Consulting, LLC  
P.O. Box 1049  
Davis, CA 95617  
[susan@strachanconsult.com](mailto:susan@strachanconsult.com)

John Carrier  
CH2MHill  
2485 Natomas Park Drive, Suite 600  
Sacramento, CA 95833-2987  
[jcarrier@ch2m.com](mailto:jcarrier@ch2m.com)

COUNSEL FOR APPLICANT

Chris Ellison  
Jeff Harris  
Samantha Pottenger  
Ellison, Schneider and Harris, LLP  
2600 Capitol Avenue, Suite 400  
Sacramento, CA 95816-5905  
[cte@eslawfirm.com](mailto:cte@eslawfirm.com)  
[jd@eslawfirm.com](mailto:jd@eslawfirm.com)  
[sgp@eslawfirm.com](mailto:sgp@eslawfirm.com)

INTERESTED AGENCIES

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

Great Basin Unified APCD  
Duane Ono  
Deputy Air Pollution Control Officer  
157 Short Street  
Bishop, CA 93514  
[dono@gbuapcd.org](mailto:dono@gbuapcd.org)

ENERGY COMMISSION –  
DECISIONMAKERS

KAREN DOUGLAS  
Commissioner and Presiding Member  
e-mail service preferred  
[kldougl@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:kldougl@energy.state.ca.us)

CARLA PETERMAN  
Commissioner and Presiding Member  
[cpeterma@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:cpeterma@energy.state.ca.us)

Ken Celli  
Hearing Officer  
[kcelli@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:kcelli@energy.state.ca.us)

Galen Lemei  
Adviser to Commissioner Douglas  
e-mail service preferred  
[glemei@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:glemei@energy.state.ca.us)

Jim Bartridge  
Adviser to Commissioner Peterman  
[jbartrid@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:jbartrid@energy.state.ca.us)

ENERGY COMMISSION STAFF

Mike Monasmith  
Senior Project Manager  
[mmonasmi@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:mmonasmi@energy.state.ca.us)

Richard Ratliff  
Staff Counsel IV  
[dratliff@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:dratliff@energy.state.ca.us)

ENERGY COMMISSION – PUBLIC  
ADVISER

Jennifer Jennings  
Public Adviser's Office  
e-mail service preferred  
[publicadviser@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:publicadviser@energy.state.ca.us)

## DECLARATION OF SERVICE

I, Mineka Foggie, declare that on, October 26, 2011, I served and filed copies of the attached Issues Identification Report, dated October 26, 2011. The original document, filed with the Docket Unit or the Chief Counsel, as required by the applicable regulation, 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/hidden\\_hills/index.html](http://www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/hidden_hills/index.html)].

The document has been sent to the other parties in this proceeding (as shown on the Proof of Service list) and to the Commission's Docket Unit or Chief Counsel, as appropriate, in the following manner:

*(Check all that Apply)*

For service to all other parties:

- ☒ Served electronically to all e-mail addresses on the Proof of Service list;
- ☐ Served by delivering on this date, either personally, or for mailing with the U.S. Postal Service with first-class postage thereon fully prepaid, to the name and address of the person served, for mailing that same day in the ordinary course of business; that the envelope was sealed and placed for collection and mailing on that date to those addresses NOT marked "e-mail preferred."

**AND**

For filing with the Docket Unit at the Energy Commission:

- ☒ by sending an original paper copy and one electronic copy, mailed with the U.S. Postal Service with first class postage thereon fully prepaid and e-mailed respectively, to the address below (preferred method); **OR**
- ☐ by depositing an original and 12 paper copies in the mail with the U.S. Postal Service with first class postage thereon fully prepaid, as follows:

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION – DOCKET UNIT  
Attn: Docket No. 11-AFC-2  
1516 Ninth Street, MS-4  
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512  
[docket@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:docket@energy.state.ca.us)

***OR, if filing a Petition for Reconsideration of Decision or Order pursuant to Title 20, § 1720:***

- ☐ Served by delivering on this date one electronic copy by e-mail, and an original paper copy to the Chief Counsel at the following address, either personally, or for mailing with the U.S. Postal Service with first class postage thereon fully prepaid:

California Energy Commission  
Michael J. Levy, Chief Counsel  
1516 Ninth Street MS-14  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
[mlevy@energy.state.ca.us](mailto:mlevy@energy.state.ca.us)

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct, that I am employed in the county where this mailing occurred, and that I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the proceeding.