

# National Geothermal Collaborative

## *Final Meeting Summary*

### *Impediments to Siting on Federal Lands Workgroup*

February 7, 2003

RESOLVE, DC Office

#### **In attendance:**

Paul Dunlevy – Bureau of Land Management  
Arlene Rocobado (Alternate for Mike McKinney – Southern California Edison)  
Karl Gawell – Geothermal Energy Association  
Susan Norwood – Department of Energy

-----

Joel Renner – INEEL  
Kathleen Rutherford – RESOLVE Inc.  
Jody Erikson – RESOLVE, Inc.

---

#### **Objectives:**

The objective of this meeting was to get feedback on organizational and procedural changes, on the Scope of Work and Table of Contents for the findings document.

#### **Introduction:**

Kathleen opened the meeting by mentioning the need to reevaluate how the document was organized and to propose some procedural recommendations. Her conversations with BLM led to rethinking the best way to organize the document. The process for the document development will be structured similarly to a single text negotiation.

#### **Scope of Work:**

##### *Definitions:*

Definitions of land types to include in the Findings Document – It was agreed the scope of work would include and clearly delineate types of land and related issues as follows: impediments to siting and development on (1) Federal Lands (all lands subject to Federal agency jurisdiction), including tribal values on Federal and adjacent lands, and (2) tribal lands.

##### *Wording Concerns*

In the sentence, “this will include....to clarify impediments.” Clarify does not seem to accurately reflect the weight or significance of the work.

<p><b>ACTION:</b> Kathleen will rewrite the scope of work to include the</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>? two types of lands (Federal, Tribal) and delineate those issues that relate to each</li><li>? reword the sentence with ‘clarify’</li><li>? identify the federal interagency task force</li></ul>
---

#### **Overall Organization of the Document:**

The definitions of *Siting* and *Access* were clarified.

### Siting

For the purposes of this paper, siting is defined as that which relates directly to permitting- the physical, or pending actions on the ground. Examples include that which pertain to plant operations- permits, resource clearances, duplication of environmental efforts (e.g. Glass Mountain, Telephone Flats KGRA EIS, CEC required their own environmental clearance).

Siting will also cover the following subsets of issues as currently identified in the findings document:

- ? Timeframe (mostly...)
- ? Duplication of effort
- ? Balance between multiple uses and need for clean energy
- ? Environmental and Social/Cultural Impacts
  - o Air quality
  - o Water (operation and cooling tower)
  - o Tribal values/spiritual values
  - o Recreation

### Access

The *Access* section will address those issues pertaining to impediments that are not siting related. Under this rubric, access issues include (but are not limited to) administrative delays and or/duplicative efforts; issues pertaining to interagency coordination and planning; legislative and/or regulatory matters; and environmental and socio-cultural impacts.

- ? Legislative and regulatory;
- ? Administrative Delays (agency budget/capacity issues;lack of adequate land use review experience with regard to geothermal siting);
- ? Interagency planning and coordination;
- ? Duplication of effort
- ? Environmental and Social Impacts
  - o Air quality
  - o Water
  - o Noise
  - o Drilling

### **Document Section Authors:**

Kathleen would like to have review authors for the three major sections. This person would review the section and help shape it for accuracy and appropriateness of facts and underlying perceptions. The entire documents will then be reviewed by the whole group.

Sections:

Section 3. Regulatory Overview – Paul Dunlevy

Section 4. Siting – Paul Dunlevy

Section 5. Access – Arlene Rocabado, to include any other issue experts at Southern California Edison

During the review process there may be an opportunity for individual industry representatives to review the document. The group will decide when, during the process, would be the most appropriate time.

**Schedule:**

- ? **February 7<sup>th</sup>** – RESOLVE, Inc. to send out revised Table of Contents and Scope of Work
- February 12<sup>th</sup>** – Work Group members to send feed back on the revisions to scope of work, table of contents and meeting summary
- ? **February 14<sup>th</sup>** – RESOLVE, Inc. to send document sections to section authors
- February 19<sup>th</sup>** – Section Authors send revisions to RESOLVE, Inc.
- ? **February 20<sup>th</sup>** – RESOLVE, Inc. circulates complete draft to work group
- ? (February 27<sup>th</sup> – Senate hearings, 10:00 AM)

Due to the Senate Hearing schedule (see above) members of the work group are scheduled to testify, and will be unavailable. The group agreed to reschedule for the following day.

- ? **February 28<sup>th</sup>** – Impediments work group meeting at the D.C. RESOLVE office, 8:00AM – 4:30 PM (RESOLVE, Inc. will notify Gordon Bloomquist, Troy Gagliano, and Liz Battocletti)

**Sector Representation:**

Kathleen is searching for Forest Service representation for the document. The Native American perspective is represented by Roger Fragua. There is no environmental representation for the document or for the NGC Steering Committee. Rich Ferguson (CEERT) has dropped off the Steering Committee. Karl Gawell mentioned he has some contacts in this sector. Kathleen will follow up to obtain those names, contact information.