

STATE OF CALIFORNIA


Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission

In re the Matter of:

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATION FOR
THE HIDDEN HILLS SOLAR ENERGY
GENERATION PROJECT

DOCKET NO. 11-AFC-2

**PREHEARING CONFERENCE STATEMENT
INTERVENOR, COUNTY OF INYO**



February 19, 2013

RANDY H. KELLER, County Counsel (205962)

DANA M. CROM, Deputy County Counsel (148091)

COUNTY OF INYO

Post Office Box M

224 North Edwards Street

Independence, California 93526

Telephone: (760) 878-0229

Facsimile: (760) 878-2241

GREGORY L. JAMES, Special Legal Counsel (055760)

Attorney at Law

c/o Inyo County Counsel

1830 Shoshone Drive

Bishop, California, California 93514

(760) 873-8381

**PREHEARING CONFERENCE STATEMENT
INTERVENOR, COUNTY OF INYO**

Intervenor, County of Inyo, a political subdivision of the State of California, hereby submits this Prehearing Conference Statement.

I.

SUBJECT AREAS COMPLETED AND RIPE FOR HEARING

The County is prepared to proceed with respect to all subject areas addressed in its testimony and rebuttal testimony. Those areas include: General Project Comments, Biological Resources, Land Use, Socioeconomics, Traffic and Transportation, Water Supply, Visual, and Noise.

II.

SUBJECT AREAS NOT RIPE FOR HEARING

As noted above, the County is prepared to proceed with all subject areas included in its comments. The County is aware that staff has not submitted rebuttal testimony in the area of Socioeconomics and is continuing to analyze the County's Opening Testimony.

III.

SUBJECT AREAS IN DISPUTE

Based on the FSA, Opening Testimony and Rebuttal Testimony filed in this matter, the subject areas the County continues to dispute are as follows:

A. GENERAL PROJECT COMMENTS

1. The County maintains that Conditions of Certification aimed at mitigating the impacts from the facility on the neighboring community of Charleston View are necessary. The FSA fails to incorporate any mitigation to lessen the impacts caused by the overall presence of the project to the local residents, some of who will reside within a few hundred feet of the facility. Title 21 of the Inyo County Codebook of Ordinance requires the adoption of mitigation measures to address impacts to the County's environment, which is defined as "the ecological environment of the county as well as the social, aesthetic and economic environment of the count." ICC Title 21, section 21.08.010. In response to the PSA, the Inyo County Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution specifying the conditions which

would be imposed under Title 21 if the project were permitted by the County. The inclusion of the Conditions of Certification set forth in that resolution and as modified in the County's Testimony is necessary to comply with Title 21, a County LORS.

B. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

1. The areas in dispute with respect to Biological Resources are as follows:

a. **Weed Abatement:** The County concurs with staff that the applicant must be financially responsible for the enforcement and abatement of noxious weeds which may travel to surrounding properties. Moreover, the County concurs with staff in that the proposed mitigation measure, such as truck washing, is necessary in order to limit the potential spread of noxious weeds which occur in Nevada and must be abated in California. The County maintains that the proposed conditions of certification contained in the FSA are necessary.

b. **Mitigation Lands:** The County objects to the location of any mitigation lands within Inyo County on private land. The limited supply of private land for potential economic development within the County will be further impacted should this project result in the placement of mitigation lands in the County, by either the applicant directly or by a wild life agency through a "payment in lieu" program. Should mitigation lands be sited within Inyo County, an economic analysis of such lands must be undertaken and financial mitigation provided for the lost economic opportunity to the County.

C. LAND USE

1. The areas in dispute with respect to Land Use are as follows:

a. **General Plan/Zoning:** The project is not consistent with the County's General Plan and Zoning. The County disputes the Applicant's interpretation of the County's General Plan and Zoning.

b. **Merger:** The applicant must merge the lots compromising the project site, consisting of 170 separate parcels. Absent merger, structures will be constructed over property lines. Failure to merge the lots conflicts with the County's subdivision ordinance, building standards and best practices.

c. **Road Abandonment:** The project site is accessible by a series of roads offered for dedication in 1974. The County maintains that the roads have been accepted by the public and, thus,

are now public roads. Due to the property right created by the public's acceptance of those roads, the roads must be abandoned by the Inyo County Board of Supervisors prior to construction.

d. Reclamation: Title 21 of the Inyo County Codebook of Ordinances requires the posting of adequate financial assurances for the purposes of reclaiming the project site. The applicant's requested modifications to the proposed Conditions of Certification contained in the FSA fails to comply with Title 21 for the reclamation of the facility at the end of its lifespan.

D. SOCIOECONOMIC

1. The areas in dispute with respect to Socioeconomic are as follows:

a. Environmental Justice: Both the FSA and the applicant's conclusions that the project does not raise environmental justice issues is incorrect. Using available demographic data, which does not include the dissimilarly situated communities of Bishop and Pahrump, Nevada, supports the findings that the project will create environmental justice issues. In addition, the conclusions reached by CEC staff and the applicant fail to include in their respective analysis that the area in question has been designated as a disadvantaged community by the California Department of Water Resources. Appropriate mitigation is necessary to address this impact.

b. Title 21 of the Inyo County Codebook of Ordinances: The FSA and applicant's testimony fails to include Title 21 as a LORS. Project approval must include Conditions of Certification which comply with Title 21, specifically the requirement that the County's service related expenses are paid by the applicant and not the residents of Inyo County. Conditions intended to ensure compliance with Title 21 are set forth in the Inyo County Board of Supervisors' Resolution 2012-29 adopted on July 17, 2012 filed in response to the Preliminary Staff Assessment and the County's Opening Testimony.

(i) Service Related Impacts: The FSA erroneously concludes that services related impact costs will be significantly less than those estimated by County elected officials and Department Heads who regular provide services to the remote region where the project is located. The County disputes those conclusions and maintains that the uncertainties presented by the remote location of the project may present significant expense to the County. Furthermore, the uncertainties of where the workforce will reside during the workweek presents the potential for serious service impact costs. Due to the uncertainty of the nature and extent of those costs, Conditions of Certification are necessary to provide a mechanism for the County to assure project related service costs are reimbursed.

(ii) Sales and Use Tax: Title 21 requires mitigation measures which will assure that the necessary project related service costs are bore exclusively by the applicant and not imposed on the County and its residents. The FSA significantly overstates the estimated sales and use tax which may flow to the County should the applicant ensure that steps are taken by the contractors and subcontractors to designate the County for purposes of sales and use tax. Moreover, as noted above, limiting the County to sales and use tax revenues fails to assure that potential service related costs which exceed those revenues are paid by the applicant.

E. TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

1. The County concurs with staff's proposed Conditions of Certification concerning the need for the applicant to monitor Old Spanish Trail from the project site to Highway 127 and repair any damage caused to that portion of Old Spanish Trail from project related traffic impacts, including workforce traffic and any heavy truck which may use that route. The County further concurs with staff with respect to the designed right-of-ways. The County objects to the request by the applicant to reconsider the necessary acceleration/deceleration lanes through a traffic analysis after licensing. The County maintains that such lanes are necessary for safety.

F. WATER SUPPLY

1. The County concurs with staff that the proposed Conditions of Certification contained in the FSA are necessary to monitor and mitigate for ground water related impacts which may result from the project. The County does not agree with the arguments raised by the applicant that the conditions are unnecessary and disagrees with the applicant's interpretation of the groundwater pump tests.

G. VISUAL IMPACTS

1. The County concurs with staff that the proposed project will present visual impacts which cannot, with mitigation, be reduced to less than significant. However, the County maintains that the significant impact to the residents of Charleston View, who will be living in the shadows of the towers, should be provided more than landscaping to minimize the impact.

G. Noise

1. The County concurs with staff's proposed conditions and does not agree with the arguments raised by the applicant that the conditions should be modified. Based on the applicant's testimony, the County believes that additional conditions should be required to ensure less than significant impacts during construction.

IV.

WITNESSES

The County of Inyo intends to offer the following witnesses:

A. Supervisor Linda Arcularius

1. Time for Testimony: 1 hour
2. Live Testimony
3. Summary: Supervisor Arcularius represents the First Supervisorial District and sits as the Chairperson of the Inyo County Board of Supervisors. Supervisor Arcularius will testify as to the potential budgetary impact to the County and its residents should the County be forced to absorb service related impact costs resulting from the project. Supervisor Arcularius will also testify as to the intent and purpose of Title 21 and those conditions necessary to comply with Title 21.

B. Supervisor Matt Kingsley

1. Time for Testimony: 1 hour
2. Live Testimony
3. Summary: Supervisor Kingsley represents the Fifth Supervisorial District, which includes the location of the project site. Supervisor Kingsley will testify as to the impacts from the location of the facility within his district, including the impacts to the communities of Tecopa, Shohone and Charleston View. Supervisor Kingsley will also testify to the financial impacts to the County should it be forced to absorb service related impact costs resulting from the project. Supervisor Kingsley will further testify as to the demographics of his district.

C. Kevin Carunchio, Inyo County Administrative Officer/Budget Officer

1. Time for Testimony: 2 hours
2. Live Testimony
3. Summary: Mr. Carunchio is the County Administrative Officer and the Budget Officer for Inyo County. He will testify as to the County's budget, the various sources of revenues and the potential impacts to County services should the County be required to absorb service related costs resulting from the project. Mr. Carunchio will also testify as to the purpose and intent of Title 21.

Further, Mr. Carunchio will testify as to the challenges faced by the County when providing services to the remote regions of the County, specifically the Charleston View area. Mr. Carunchio will also testify as to the County's efforts to reach agreement with the applicant with respect to sales and use tax revenues and potential impacts to the County.

D. Claude Gruen, Gruen, Gruen + Associates

1. Time for Testimony: 2 hours
2. Live Testimony
3. Summary: Dr. Gruen, an economist and principal in the firm Gruen, Gruen + Associates, will testify as to the socioeconomic impacts to the County as a result of the project. Dr. Gruen will specifically address the report prepared by Dr. Richard McCann, testifying as to his opinion of the accuracy and reliability of that report. Dr. Gruen will also address the service related impact costs and uncertainties from the project, both during construction and operations. Dr. Gruen will further address the lost opportunity costs to the County as a result of the reduction in the limited inventory of privately held land in Inyo County.

E. Eric Myers, Esq., MuniServices, LLC

1. Time for Testimony: 1 hour
2. Live Testimony
3. Summary: Mr. Myers is staff counsel for MuniServices LLC and specializes in sales and use tax law. Mr. Myers will testify as to the allocation of sales and use taxes to the County under various scenarios. Mr. Myers will further testify as to the potential impact to sales and use tax revenues under California Alternative Energy and Advanced Transportation Financing Authority ("CAEAFTA"). Mr. Myers will also address the limitations on the use of certain sales and use tax revenues allocated to the County.

F. Joshua Hart, Inyo County Planning Director

1. Time for Testimony: 2 hours
2. Live Testimony
3. Summary: Mr. Hart is the Planning Director for the Inyo County Planning Department. Mr. Hart will testify as to the fact that the proposed project fails to comply with the Inyo

County General Plan and Zoning Code, the Subdivision Map Act, building standards and best practices. Mr. Hart will further testify to the need for the 170 parcels to be merged, the demographic composition of the area, including recent census data. Mr. Hart will also testify as to the County's standards as to potential noise related impacts and necessary conditions to mitigate for those impacts. Lastly, Mr. Hart will testify as to the requirements under Title 21, including the need for a reclamation plan and the posting of financial assurances.

G. Doug Wilson, Inyo County Public Works Interim Director

1. Time for Testimony: 2 hours

2. Live Testimony

3. Summary: Mr. Wilson is the interim Director for the Inyo County Public Works Department. Mr. Wilson will address the potential impacts to Old Spanish Trail during the construction and operations of the project. Mr. Wilson will address the nature of the various roads within Inyo County leading to the project site, the anticipated route for the construction workforce and the impacts the project is likely to have on County roads, specifically Old Spanish Trail. Mr. Wilson will testify as to the need for the applicant to both monitor and repair Old Spanish Trail from the project site to Highway 127, the problems presented by heavy truck traffic and increased vehicular traffic on Emigrant Pass and the need for acceleration and deceleration lanes at the project site. Mr. Wilson will also address the potential fiscal impacts to his department as a result of this project.

H. Bob Brown, Inyo County Road Commissioner

1. Time for Testimony: 1 hour

2. Live Testimony

3. Summary: Mr. Brown is the Inyo County Road Commissioner. Mr. Brown will testify as to the network of roads located on the project site and the lack of any physical barriers or notices closing those roads. Mr. Brown will also testify as to the use of those roads by the public in general.

I. Robert Harrington, Ph.D, R.G., Inyo County Water Director

1. Time for testimony: 2 hours

2. Live Testimony

3. Summary: Dr. Harrington is a hydrologist and registered geologist and is the director of the Inyo County Water Department. Dr. Harrington will testify in support of the conditions of certification proposed in the FSA. Dr. Harrington will further testify as to the impact the project will have on the County and its potential to access grant funding under state law requiring the monitoring of groundwater basins.

J. George Milovich, Inyo/Mono Agricultural Commissioner

1. Time for Testimony: 1 hour

2. Live Testimony

3. Summary: Mr. Milovich is the Agricultural Commissioner for Inyo and Mono Counties. Mr. Milovich will testify as to the legal mandate on his department to control noxious weeds and to support the proposed conditions of certification in the FSA for weed management. Mr. Milovich will also address the jurisdiction of his department in the enforcement of weed management and the fiscal impacts to his department should the project result in an increase in monitoring and eradication in the area of the project site.

K. Bill Lutze, Inyo County Sheriff

1. Time for Testimony: 1 hour

2. Live Testimony

3. Summary: Sheriff Bill Lutze is the Sheriff of Inyo County and has worked for the Inyo County Sheriff's Department for 40 years. Sheriff Lutze will testify as to the potential impact to his department as a result of both the construction and operation of the facility. Sheriff Lutze will testify as to the necessary staffing levels to meet the demands presented by the project given its remote location and the fiscal impacts as a result of the increased staffing needs.

L. Leslie Chapman, CPA, Inyo County Auditor/Controller

1. Time for Testimony: 30 Minutes

2. Live Testimony

3. Summary: Ms. Chapman is the Auditor/Controller for the County of Inyo. Ms. Chapman will testify as to the revenues received by the County and the allocation of those revenues,

specifically the County's receipt of sales and use tax. Ms. Chapman will also testify as to the budget for Inyo County.

V.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

A. Richard McCann

1. Time for Cross-Examination: 1 hour

2. Summary: The County intends to cross-examine Dr. McCann as to the presumptions and conclusions reached in his socioeconomic analysis. Specifically, the County wishes to cross-examine Dr. McCann as to his opinion with respect to service impact costs, sales and use tax and other revenues estimated to flow to the County as a result of the project and lost opportunity costs to the County in the event private property is used for mitigation lands. The County further intends to examine Dr. McCann as to his presumptions concerning estimated expenditures in Inyo County, the anticipated impacts from the workforce, the anticipated temporary housing for the workforce and the impact the remote location of the project has on his opinions and presumptions.

B. Jennifer Scholl

1. Time for Cross-Examination: 1 hour

2. Summary: The County desires to cross-examine Ms. Scholl as to her proffered testimony as to the project's compliance with the County's General Plan and Zoning Code and other testimony offered in the applicant's land use testimony. The cross-examination of Ms. Scholl would include the legal opinion proffered by Ms. Scholl concerning the need to abandon the network of public roads located on the project site.

C. Clay Jensen

1. Time for Cross-Examination: 1 Hour

2. Summary: The County desires to cross-examine Mr. Jensen as to his proffered testimony as to the projects compliance with the County's General Plan and Zoning and other testimony offered in the applicant's land use testimony. The cross-examination of Mr. Jensen would include the legal opinion proffered by Mr. Jensen concerning the need to abandon the network of public roads located

on the project site. Mr. Jensen will also be cross-examined with respect to his proffered testimony with respect to socioeconomic impacts to the County contained in the applicant's Opening Testimony and Rebuttal Testimony, including the presumptions concerning necessary County service levels and environmental justice impacts.

D. Fatuma Yusuf, Ph.D.

1. Time for Cross-Examination: 1 Hour

2. Summary: The County desires to cross-examine Dr. Yusuf concerning her proffered testimony as to the socioeconomic impacts to the County and the environmental justice impacts resulting from the project. The County desires to cross-examine Dr. Yusuf as to her presumptions concerning necessary County service levels, impacts to County departments, economic benefits flowing to the County as a result of the project from project related expenditures, taxes and other revenue sources.

E. Loren Bloomberg, P.E.

1. Time for Cross-Examination: 1 Hour

2. Summary: The County desires to cross-examine Mr. Bloomberg as to his proffered statements concerning the impacts to Old Spanish Trail and County roads as a result of the construction and operation of the project. The cross-examination will include Mr. Bloomberg's opinion that the proposed conditions of certification requiring the monitoring and repair of Old Spanish Trail from the project site to Highway 127 and the need for acceleration and deceleration lanes.

F. Thomas Priestley, Ph.D., AICP/ASLA

1. Time for Cross-Examination: 1 Hour

2. Summary: The County desires to cross-examination Dr. Priestley as to his proffered testimony that the project will not result in a significant impact to visual resources. The County wishes to cross-examine Dr. Priestley with respect to his opinion as to the adequacy of the applicant's proposed mitigation to bring reduce the impact to less than significant.

G. Tim Thompson, Dr. John Jansen, Michael Rojansky, Dr. Geof Spaulding, and Matt Franck

1. Time for Cross-Examination: 1 Hour

2. Summary: The County desires to cross-examine the witnesses offered by the applicant in its Opening and Rebuttal Testimony to support its proposed conditions of certification with respect to groundwater monitoring and mitigation, specifically the impact presumptions made with respect to the groundwater pump tests conducted by the applicant through its groundwater modeling.

VI.

EVIDENCE

- A. General Project Comments: Exhibits 900-904, 937, 940 and 942.
- B. Biological Resources: Exhibits 900-904, 914, 923, 924, 942, 946 and 947.
- C. Land Use: Exhibits 900-922, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 940, 942 and 943.
- D. Socioeconomic: Exhibits 900-922, 934, 935, 937, 938, 940, 942, 944 and 945.
- E. Traffic and Transportation: Exhibits 900-905, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 939, 940, 942 and 944.
- F. Water Supply: Exhibits 900-904, 923, 924, 930, 934, 940, 942, 946 and 947.
- G. Visual: Exhibits 900-904, 910, 911, 935, 937 and 942.
- H. Noise: Exhibits 900-904, 931, 932, 933, 936, 937 and 942.

VII.

CONDITIONS OF CERTIFICATION

- A. The County's proposed modifications to the Conditions of Certification contained in the FSA are attached hereto as Attachment 1.

VIII.

SCHEDULING ISSUES


- A. The County believes the hearings will exceed the current schedule of 4 days. Should additional hearing dates be necessary, and the location for those hearings is outside Inyo County, the County requests that the County's witnesses be taken during the hearings scheduled in Shoshone. Not only will it create an economic hardship for the County to have its witnesses travel outside Inyo County,

it is imperative to the public process that the County's residents be permitted to witness its elected and appointed officials testify before the Committee. Therefore, the County requests either it be permitted to offer its testimony during the hearings in Shoshone or that any continued hearing dates also be located in Inyo County.

With respect to scheduling conflicts, the Inyo County Board of Supervisors meets every Tuesday. As such, Board members and County Department Heads are unavailable to testify on Tuesdays. With the exception of that conflict, the County currently has no conflict with respect to the scheduling of future hearings.

Dated: February 19, 2013

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Dana Crom', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Randy H. Keller, County Counsel (205962)
Dana Crom, Deputy County Counsel (148091)
P.O. Box M
224 North Edwards
Independence, CA 93526
Telephone: (760) 878-0229
Facsimile: (760) 878-2241
dcrom@inyocounty.us

**ATTACHMENT A
PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO
CONDITIONS OF CERTIFICATION**

Requested Conditions of Certification – General

In order to lessen the significant impacts to the residents of Charleston View, the following Conditions of Certification should be ordered.

GENERAL COC-1: Project owner shall construct and maintain a facility in the community of Charleston View at which the local residents may use for a meeting place. The facility may be combined with other uses, such as fire, emergency services and/or law enforcement.

Verification: Within 180 days of the commencement of construction, project owner shall provide the location and plans and specifications for the facility, which shall be constructed and become operational no later than the commencement of operations.

GENERAL COC-2: Project owner shall construct a cellular communications tower on the project site and allow its use by any cellular communications company for the purpose of expanding and/or improving cellular communications service to the vicinity of the project site, including the community of Charleston View. To the extent necessary, the project owner shall work with the County to secure a cellular communications company to provide such service.

Verification: Within 180 days of the construction of a cellular communication tower, the project owner shall provide the status and progress made toward fulfilling this condition to the CPM and the County of Inyo.

GENERAL COC-3: Within 30 days of the commencement of construction, project owner shall provide financial compensation to each resident in Charleston View in an amount which would be sufficient for the resident to relocate to a location away from the project site at the sole discretion of the resident. The amount of mitigation compensation shall be approved by the CPM after consultation with the County of Inyo and, to the extent practical, the residents of Charleston View.

Verification: Within 30 days of the commencement of construction project owner shall provide proof of the agreed upon amount of the economic mitigation and proof of payment to each resident of Charleston View.

Requested Modifications to Conditions of Certification – Land Use

-Modify COC Land-1 as follows: The project owner shall comply with the Subdivision Map Act (Pub. Resources Code Section 66410-66499.58) by adhering to the provisions of Title 16, Subdivisions, Inyo County Code of Ordinances to merge the parcels and extinguish the roads and easements on the parcels in a manner acceptable to the County ensure legality of parcels and site control.

-Modify COCs BIO-26, COM-14 and COM-15 so that they are consistent with LAND-2.

-Add new COC Land-5 as follows: The project owner shall demonstrate a good-faith effort to process a General Plan Amendment and Zoning Reclassification for the project site.

Verification: At least thirty (30) days prior to construction of the HHSEGS project, the project owner shall submit evidence to the CPM indicating that it has worked with the County to process the GPA/ZR application for the project. Such evidence may consist of an Order from the Inyo County Board of Supervisors approving or disapproving of said application.

Requested Findings of Fact and Conditions of Certification – Socioeconomics

Requested Revision of Proposed Finding of Fact Number 5 (additions are shown by underlining and deletions are shown by strikeover)

5. The sales tax and other revenue generated for Inyo County during the construction and operation periods ~~would~~ may or may not be greater than the estimated potential County expenditures resulting from the project. ~~Therefore~~ With the imposition of the proposed conditions of certification, including Socio-4 & 5, the County would have adequate financial resources to provide appropriate Sheriff's protection and other services to the project site and southern Inyo County.

Requested New Condition of Certification—SOCIO- 4

SOCIO-4: In order to ensure that the fiscal revenues received by Inyo County as a direct result of the project are adequate to cover Inyo County's costs of providing project-related services and infrastructure as a result of the HHSEGS, the project owner and Inyo County shall:

1. Within 180 days of the first June 30th after the start of construction of the project, the County of Inyo shall submit to the project owner a statement of costs of providing project-related services and infrastructure that were incurred by the County since the start of construction of the project together with a statement of the total amount of sales and use tax received pursuant to the Bradley-Burns Uniform Local Sales and Use Tax Law (the Bradley-Burns local tax allocation) and property tax received by the County as a direct result of the project since the start of construction. Each year thereafter, the County of Inyo shall submit to the project owner an annual statement of costs of providing project-related services and infrastructure that were incurred by the County during the previous year together with a statement of the total amount of the Bradley-Burns local tax allocation and property tax received by the County during the previous year as a direct result of the project.
2. If a statement submitted by the County of Inyo to the project owner shows that the project-related costs incurred by the County exceed the total amount of the Bradley-Burns local tax allocation and property tax received by the County as a direct result of the project during the period of time covered by the statement, unless the project owner challenges the statement as provided below, within 60 days of receipt of the statement, the project owner shall pay to the County the difference between the costs and the tax revenue.
3. If the project owner believes that the amount of the costs or tax revenues presented in a statement is incorrect, within 30 days of the receipt of the statement, the project owner shall provide to the County a written notice setting forth its reasons why it believes that the amounts are incorrect. If the project owner disagrees with the amount of sales or use tax received pursuant to the Bradley-Burns local tax allocation, the written notice shall be accompanied by an audit, undertaken at the project owner's expense, by a qualified auditor of the amount of the sales and use tax received by the County pursuant to the Bradley-Burns local tax allocation. Unless otherwise agreed by the County and the project owner, within 10 days of the receipt of the notice, the County and the project owner shall meet and confer in good faith in an attempt to resolve the objections. If the County and the project owner are in agreement on the amount to be paid by the project owner, the project owner shall pay the agreed upon amount to the County within 30 days of the date of agreement.

4. If, following the meetings between the County and the project owner, the County and the project owner remain in disagreement over the amount to be paid by the project owner, unless otherwise agreed by the County and the project owner, not later than 45 days after the receipt of the statement, the project owner may submit a written statement of the areas of disagreement to the Energy Commission for resolution. A copy of the written statement submitted to the Energy Commission shall be concurrently provided to the County. If the project owner does not submit such a written statement to the Energy Commission within the specified time, the project owner shall be deemed to have waived the right to challenge the amount in disagreement and shall pay the amount of the statement, to the County within 60 days of receipt of the statement.

5. A disagreement between the County and the project owner over the amount of a statement submitted to the Energy Commission shall be resolved by the Energy Commission as described in the section titled "Noncompliance Complaint Procedures" described in the "General Conditions Including Compliance Monitoring and Closure Plan" of the FSA. If the CEC makes a final determination that Hidden Hills Solar should pay any amount to the County, the payment shall be made to the County within 30 days of such determination. Such a determination by the CEC shall not be appealable by Inyo County or the project owner.

6. County shall be reimbursed all costs of auditing and verifying BOE remittances.

Verification: Within 30 days of a payment by the project owner to the County of Inyo as provided in 2, 3, 4 or 5 above, the project owner shall provide evidence of such payment to the CPM.

Requested New Condition of Certification—SOCIO-5

SOCIO-5. In order to assure that the County is fully mitigated for economic impact resulting from the placement of mitigation lands within the County of Inyo, the project owner shall:

1. The project owner and the CEC, in coordination with the County, shall investigate and implement means to enhance degraded public lands (including lands designated Wilderness), rather than use private lands in Inyo County for compensatory mitigation, including investigating and advocating for means to quantify restoration activities on public lands in lieu of direct compensatory mitigation.

2. If private lands within Inyo County are to be used as compensatory mitigation for impacts of the project, whether such lands are selected before or after certification of the project and whether such lands are selected by the project owner, the Department of Fish and Wildlife or another wildlife agency using funds paid by project owner to satisfy any mitigation condition, prior to selection of such lands, the CEC will cause a study of the lost economic opportunity costs which the County would suffer as a result of the conversion of the private lands to mitigation lands and the environmental impacts what would result from such conversion and, if any such lands are selected, that the CEC will impose appropriate mitigation, including economic mitigation mandated by Title 21 of the Inyo County Code of Ordinances, to fully offset any identified adverse impacts to the County and/or to the environment.

Requested Findings of Fact – Noise

Add a new COC to Noise as follows: If a resident or residents in Charleston View notify the CPM of disturbing construction noise and request mitigation, the project owner shall immediately cease the disturbing construction activities and work with the resident to install noise-reduction features on the primary residential structure, such as noise reducing windows, walls, ventilation systems, and/or other features determined in consultation with the resident. Once the features have been installed, the disturbing construction activities may recommence.

Verification: Prior to ground disturbance, the project owner shall transmit to the CPM a statement acknowledging that the above restrictions will be observed throughout the construction of the project.



**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***

Docket No. 11-AFC-02

**PROOF OF SERVICE
(Revised 2/14/13)**

SERVICE LIST:

APPLICANT

BrightSource Energy
Stephen Wiley
Michelle L. Farley
Bradley Brownlow
1999 Harrison Street, Suite 2150
Oakland, CA 94612-3500
swiley@brightsourceenergy.com
mfarley@brightsourceenergy.com
bbrownlow@brightsourceenergy.com

BrightSource Energy
Clay Jensen
Gary Kazio
410 South Rampart Blvd., Suite 390
Las Vegas, NV 89145
cjensen@brightsourceenergy.com
gkazio@brightsourceenergy.com

APPLICANTS' CONSULTANTS

Strachan Consulting, LLC
Susan Strachan
P.O. Box 1049
Davis, CA 95617
susan@strachanconsult.com

CH2MHill
John Carrier
2485 Natomas Park Drive, Suite 600
Sacramento, CA 95833-2987
jcarrier@ch2m.com

APPLICANT'S COUNSEL

Chris Ellison
Jeff Harris
Samantha Pottenger
Ellison, Schneider and Harris, LLP
2600 Capitol Avenue, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95816-5905
cte@eslawfirm.com
jdh@eslawfirm.com
sgp@eslawfirm.com

INTERVENORS

Jon William Zellhoefer
P.O. Box 34
Tecopa, CA 92389
jon@zellhoefer.info

Center for Biological Diversity
Lisa T. Belenky, Sr. Attorney
351 California Street, Suite 600
San Francisco, CA 94104
lbelenky@biologicaldiversity.org

Center for Biological Diversity
Ileene Anderson
Public Lands Desert Director
PMB 447
8033 Sunset Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90046
ianderson@biologicaldiversity.org

Old Spanish Trail Association
Jack Prichett
857 Nowita Place
Venice, CA 90291
jackprichett@ca.rr.com

INTERVENORS (Cont'd.)

Cindy R. MacDonald
3605 Silver Sand Court
N. Las Vegas, NV 89032
sacredintent@centurylink.net

Richard Arnold
P.O. Box 3411
Pahrump, NV 89041
rwnold@hotmail.com

Amargosa Conservancy
Donna Lamm, Executive Director
Brian Brown
Watershed Coordinator
Route 127, P.O. Box 63
Shoshone, CA 92384
donnalamm@amargosaconservancy.org

County of Inyo
Randy H. Keller, County Counsel
Dana Crom
Deputy County Counsel
244 N. Edwards St., P.O. Box M
Independence, CA 93526
dcrom@inyocounty.us

INTERESTED AGENCIES

California ISO
e-recipient@caiso.com

Great Basin Unified APCD
Duane Ono
Deputy Air Pollution Control Officer
157 Short Street
Bishop, CA 93514
dono@gbuapcd.org

INTERESTED AGENCIES (Cont'd.)

Nye County
Lorinda A. Wichman, Chairman
Board of County Supervisors
P.O. Box 153
Tonopah, NV 89049
lawichman@gmail.com

Nye County Water District
L. Darrel Lacy
Interim General Manager
2101 E. Calvada Boulevard
Suite 100
Pahrump, NV 89048
llacy@co.nye.nv.us

National Park Service
Michael L. Elliott
Cultural Resources Specialist
National Trails Intermountain Region
P.O. Box 728
Santa Fe, NM 87504-0728
Michael_Elliott@nps.gov

Southern Inyo
Fire Protection District
Larry Levy, Fire Chief
P.O. Box 51
Tecopa, CA 92389
sifpd@yahoo.com

ENERGY COMMISSION STAFF

Mike Monasmith
Senior Project Manager
mike.monasmith@energy.ca.gov

Richard Ratliff
Staff Counsel IV
dick.ratliff@energy.ca.gov

Kerry Willis
Staff Counsel
kerry.willis@energy.ca.gov

**ENERGY COMMISSION –
PUBLIC ADVISER**

Blake Roberts
Assistant Public Adviser
publicadviser@energy.ca.gov

COMMISSION DOCKET UNIT

California Energy Commission
– Docket Unit
Attn: Docket No. 11-AFC-02
1516 Ninth Street, MS-4
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512
docket@energy.ca.gov

**OTHER ENERGY COMMISSION
PARTICIPANTS (LISTED FOR
CONVENIENCE ONLY):**

***After docketing, the Docket
Unit will provide a copy to the
persons listed below. Do not
send copies of documents to
these persons unless
specifically directed to do so.***

KAREN DOUGLAS
Commissioner and Presiding
Member

*DAVID R. HOCHSCHILD
Commissioner and Associate
Member

Ken Celli
Hearing Adviser

Galen Lemei
Adviser to Presiding Member

Jennifer Nelson
Adviser to Presiding Member

TBD
Adviser to Associate Member

Eileen Allen
Commissioners' Technical
Adviser for Facility Siting

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

I, Debra Gonzalez, declare that on February 19, 2013, I served and filed copies of the attached Prehearing Conference Statement Intervenor, County of Inyo, dated February 19, 2013. This document is accompanied by the most recent Proof of Service, which I copied from the web page for this project at:
<http://www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/hiddenhills/>.

The document has been sent to the other persons on the Service List above in the following manner:

(Check one)

For service to all other parties and filing with the Docket Unit at the Energy Commission:


 X I e-mailed the document to all e-mail addresses on the Service List above and personally delivered it or deposited it in the US mail with first class postage to those parties noted above as "hard copy required"; **OR**

and

 X Instead of e-mailing the document, I personally delivered it or deposited it in the US mail with first class postage to all of the persons on the Service List for whom a mailing address is given.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct, and that I am over the age of 18 years.

Dated: February 19, 2013


Debra J. Gonzalez