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DEIS  Draft Environmental Impact Statement
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROJECT SUMMARY

DCR Transmission, LLC (DCRT) has filed a right-of-way (ROW) application with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) that proposes to construct, operate, maintain, and decommission a proposed electric transmission project that would begin near Tonopah, Arizona and terminate near Blythe, California (Figure 1-1). The proposed Ten West Link 500kV Transmission Line Project (the Project) would consist of a 500 kilovolt (kV) transmission line traversing approximately 114 miles.

The lead agency for the Project is the BLM; Arizona has been designated the lead state; and the Yuma Field Office (YFO) is the lead office. Multiple decisions will be required for the Project. The decision regarding the proposed ROW grant on BLM land is the responsibility of the BLM Yuma Field Office Manager. However, inconsistency with visual management classes along certain portions of the proposed Project would require an amendment to the Yuma Resource Management Plan (RMP), in addition to the ROW grant. The BLM Arizona State Director will issue a separate, but related decision on the RMP amendment (RMPA). Because a portion of the Project would be in California, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) is also required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate the entirety of the Project and issue its own decision on that portion of the Project within California. The CPUC is a cooperating agency and will ensure that the EIS meets the requirements of CEQA.

In order to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) the BLM has determined that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) needs to be prepared for the Project. The EIS will analyze the effects of the Project on all lands, public and non-public, in the proposed route(s).

1.2 WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

The purpose of the workshop was to identify potential social and economic challenges posed by the Project and potential opportunities that might enhance or expand the social and economic goals of area communities. Letters of invitation to the workshop were sent to government agencies with an interest in the Project and to organizations and individuals who had expressed an interest in the Workshop during public scoping. A copy of the invitation letter and the mailing list are included in Appendix 1 along with a list of people who attended.

On the afternoon of June 14, 2016 an Economic Strategies Workshop (the Workshop) was conducted by the DCRT, Stantec, HDR, Galileo Project, and the BLM in Quartzsite, Arizona. The Workshop provided an opportunity for local and regional businesses, governments, individuals, and community organizations to identify, clarify, and discuss economic and social effects that may result from the Project. The feedback gathered from the Workshop will be used in the continuing NEPA process, to determine what types of impacts may occur from the Project. The Workshop focused on economic and social topics related to the Project; including regional economic effects, fiscal effects, and non-market impacts.
Figure 1-1
Ten West Link Proposed Action
This summary report provides a framework for analysis of social and economic issues in the Draft EIS.

2.0 WORKSHOP PROCESS

After welcoming participants, covering logistical details, and introducing presenters, the workshop started with a discussion of the cooperating agencies involved in the Project and the objectives of the Workshop. This was followed by a description of the Project, how it will be operated, possible alternative routes, and project goals. There was a brief discussion of the NEPA process and a brief description of where the Project was relative to the NEPA process. A summary of comments heard during scoping was presented with an emphasis on the comments related to social and economic matters.

An overview of area social and economic trends and conditions was then presented to provide a basis for discussion of possible Project effects in the area. The slides used during this discussion are included in Appendix 2 along with a handout given to all attendees. The graphics in the slide show and handout were generated using information supplied by DCRT’s consultant, HDR; this information is from a technical report on socioeconomics and environmental justice, which is in production at this time.

After the discussion of area trends participants were divided into discussion groups where the social and economic issues identified during scoping were used as discussion starting points. New issues and concerns were identified and existing issues were clarified. Following the smaller group discussions the full Workshop was reconvened. Notes taken during the group discussions were then shared with all attendees. Participants were encouraged to submit written comments. Transcribed notes from the smaller group discussions are presented in Appendix 3.

3.0 SUMMARY OF SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC COMMENTS

Participants had multiple opportunities to ask questions and comment on the Project and the social and economic information presented at the Workshop. These included a question and answer session, smaller group discussions, presentation of notes from the smaller group discussions during the Workshop; and written comments provided as a result of the Workshop. Each of these is presented separately below. Transcripts from the discussion groups and written comments are included in Appendix 3.

Each response was assigned an identifying letter a number (regardless of comment format), scanned, and filed in electronic and hard copy format. Group discussion comments were given a letter corresponding to the “color” the group was named (i.e., G for the Green group, O for the Orange group, Y for the Yellow group, R for the Red group, and B for the Blue group); written comments use a W for Written (for example, W-1-17; W-10-13 means written comment, commenter 10, comment 13). Discrete comments within the group transcripts and written submittals were then numbered sequentially. Socioeconomic comments from the scoping report (Section 3.1) use the numbering codes they were given during scoping to make them easier to identify.
Comments are summarized by resource topic below and include citations to responses and comment numbers for reference. The comment summaries were paraphrased from the original comments to convey the content of multiple similar comments. Comments made will be analyzed and determined as to how they will be used in the DEIS.

3.1 SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

- What changes will be made with the Resource Management Plan Amendment (RMPA)? *There will be a change to the visual resource management (VRM) classification and a corridor change.*

- Is this a private project? *The transmission line will be owned by DCRT, which is a private entity. DCRT is governed by FERC regulations for cost, etc. The CAISO will control the line capacity.*

- Will DCRT be paying property tax in Arizona? *Yes. DCRT will be paying tax on private property and lease fees for BLM land.*

- Will the lease fee to BLM increase La Paz County’s PILT (payment in lieu of taxes)? *The PILT calculation is authorized by Congress annually and is based on a specific formula. The BLM / DOI do not have direct control over that amount. PILT is a way to compensate counties with public land for the loss or property taxes they would otherwise receive.*

- Who would own the transmission line and towers? *DCRT will own the Project. The BLM would be leasing ROW to the company for the Project.*

- What is the compensation – specifically taxes – for each county? *DCRT is working on that calculation now.*

- How are residential vacancies counted for in areas such as Quartzsite where there are a lot of out-of-state owners? *Additional research is needed to answer this question. It was noted that Quartzsite has quite a few out-of-state property owners who pay taxes but aren’t counted as part of the census.*

3.2 SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ISSUES AND CONCERNS IDENTIFIED IN DISCUSSION GROUPS AND WRITTEN COMMENTS

3.2.1 Economic (Market) Values

3.2.1.1 General

- La Paz County noted that a greater portion of the proposed line (approximately 80%) will be in La Paz County. Applying any economic data from Maricopa and Riverside counties to this project for a regional overview of the study area is unfair, since La Paz has the

---

1 Citations in parentheses refer to transcription in Appendix 3
majority of the project. The economic study areas should be specific to La Paz or other counties and not on a regional (i.e., grouped) basis. (W-1-17; W-10-13)

- Need to address impacts of out of state property owners. (Workshop notes)
- Verification of accuracy of the presented data question- what is the best source data? (Workshop notes)
- Most data on housing and demographic data collected by agencies and consultants outside of Quartzsite can generally be considered to be unreliable in that they are generally based on accepted industry practices which do not take into account the unique aspects of Quartzsite’s winter visitor quirks, the unique population described above, and demographic trends which do not show up on traditional census and economic data bases. (W-10-1)

3.2.1.2 Property Values

- Property impacts because of loss of scenic quality. (Real estate values and loss of real estate tax revenue). (G-6)
- Impacts to property values if too close to residents/community facilities. (R-4)
- The public expresses high levels of aversion to … reduction in property values for properties adjacent to or around these lines or visually impacted by these lines. (W-1-4; W-1-5)
- Lease information from BLM – Will this affect existing leases? Extension of right-of-way. Effect to property owners. (W-6-2)

3.2.1.3 Recreation Expenditures and Tourism

- Recreational impacts from any areas closed would have an economic impact to local economy. (O-5; W-5-5)
- Impacts to recreational riders and recreational trails. (Peace Trail and other existing trails and riding areas.) (Y-4)
- Impacts to recreational use during construction period. (Can Quartzite construction occur during summer, May-September?) (Y-6)
- There should be a net gain to the recreational trails in the region. (Y-7; W-10-15; W-10-16)
- Perception that project will result in recreational trails closures. (Plomosa Road mentioned specifically.) (Y-8)
- Johnson Canyon - No closure of Peace Trail through Johnson Canyon. (Y-9)
- Proactive promotion of no negative impacts of line and positive benefits of the project to recreational use. (Y-10; W-10-16)
• Integration and access to open space (i.e., Too much- damage or positive economic impacts more visitors. Too little (reduce) - not enough space for visitors). (R-3)

• Possible loss of economic benefit from tourism/OHV to La Paz and Quartzsite, as well as Yuma and Mohave counties; cascading impacts on hotels, merchants, etc. (Johnson Canyon Segment). (B-1; W-10-17)

• Generational shift of Quartzsite tourism (i.e., more OHV, possibly younger tourists - may or may not be snowbirds, “Go and Do” tourism). (B-2)

• There is the direct possibility of stigmatizing effects on the visitor and tourist industries of La Paz County – one of the only revenue generating industries in the County. (W-1-14)

• Our visitors come here for the temperate, climate, affordability, regional access, and foremost, the scenic beauty of the area. (W-10-2)

• Off-road recreation is one of the few areas of the local economy which is expanding. The proposed transmission line is aligned to go up the middle of Johnson Canyon. This area is one of the only “challenging” off-road sections of the entire 750-mile Peace Trail. The proposed construction would destroy the challenging features of the trail by constructing bladed service access roads, and would create significant adverse visual impact in this pristine area. (W-10-14)

• Concerned over loss of tourism visitation and money due to degradation of the environment. (G-4)

3.2.1.4 Commercial Revenue, Employment, and Income

• Potential inability for local entities to participate in energy development because of CAISO (ultimate decision maker). (G-5)

• Keeping jobs and hiring locals first. Potential collaborative training. (AZ West College) “Boom/bust” while building/once complete. (O-1; W-5-1; W-6-3; W-6-4)

• [Regarding alternate routes CB8 and CB9] Would be direct line of site - security issue possible job loss. [Encroachment into YPG with potential jobs loss.] (O-3; W-3-1; W-5-3)

• Quartzsite economic trends/La Paz CO: Recreation, Long-term visitors, Poultry production. (O-6; W-5-6)

• Concern about impact to existing off-trails (designated trails) and mining. (Y-5: W-2-1; W-2-3; W-6-7)

• Consider economic impacts of hunting and fishing. (R-1)

• Indirect impacts if line attracts or increases solar near YPG, could impact (mission) uses - cumulative. (R-5)
• Agricultural - additional consideration for farmers (crop dusting). (R-9)

• Concern about lack of available local workforce for construction and technical jobs (counter-residuals staying, potential for positive impacts during construction). (B-6)

• In terms of the employment, spending, and income potential in La Paz County, the benefits of construction of the transmission line is negative. Most of the construction labor will come from outside the County. (W-1-8; W-10-5; W-10-6)

• The construction purchasing practices produce few benefits to La Paz County residents because the bulk of goods and services are generally produced and purchased outside the County. (W-1-9; W-10-7; W-10-9)

• The benefits seem, in these cases, to be temporary, just during the construction phase. I am hoping a more equitable resolution, not only for the County but also their tax payers, creating full time jobs long into the future. (W-8-1; W-8-2; W-10-8)

• I would be favorable to the approach taken in City of Boulder, Nevada, where legislation was enacted between the Federal Government and the State for local ownership. In return, the County, in this case La Paz, would lease the land for the very same projects presently under consideration thereby enhancing the Counties ability to provide necessary services to its citizens and the projects themselves. This would help offset the tax base loss of the Bill Williams River area. (W-8-3)

• There are 80 Army Civilian and contractors associated with the work in the Northern Cibola Range area that the powerlines would impact, and encroachment on these test facilities may put these jobs at risk. Our reservations and concerns continue to be related to the power lines running along our northern boundary line (cb-9, cb-8, and cb-7), which have line of site visibility into the Joint Experimentation Range Complex test facilities for either radio frequency waves or visual observation. (W-9-2; W-9-3)

• Quartzsite as a “base camp” for Peace Trail (i.e., other institutes- local park board staging area). (B-3)

3.2.1.5 Fiscal Impacts

• Property impacts because of loss of scenic quality. (Real estate values and loss of real estate tax revenue). (G-6)

• Loss of County revenues. (G-8)

• Clarify the benefits to La Paz County from the project. (Y-3; W-6-6; W-7-4)

• There are no fiscal benefits from Ten West Link because the local economy is designed to collect tax revenues yet the BLM plans to pay PILT which is not even close to what the County would get if this was private property. (W-1-10; W-2-2; W-10-10; W-10-11)

• Because the Ten West Link does not increase the visitor and tourist spending, it does not pay for the public services provided to its employees and contractors. Temporary construction workforces will likely add to crime rates and will require greater levels of
law enforcement resources and other public safety services. It has been evidenced in other cases that crime rates and domestic issues will raise in proportion to the population with an influx of temporary laborers working daily in the county. (W-1-11; W-1-12)

- Transmission lines CUP? (W-6-1)

### 3.2.1.6 Future Projects Accommodated with Increased Capacity

- Economic differences for I-10 build-out area with and without transmission line. Look at 50-70 year build-out vs shorter term. (O-4; W-5-4)
- Identify how project would promote development of renewable projects in La Paz County. (Y-11)
- Has the potential to open up connections to new renewable energy projects. (R-6)
- Would power line bring in or attract any other business that would need access to power other than solar or power generation - (industrial park)? (R-8)
- Loss of pristine condition in Johnson Canyon, and impacts to current business, possible chilling effect on future economic development (Johnson Canyon Segment). (B-1)
- Potential positive impacts of grid access to solar and other renewables (understanding of current transmission bottleneck). (B-5)
- We will not gain access to cheap renewable energy nor will this improve the County’s overall grid flexibility, nor will it create economic development opportunities locally. In some cases, it reduces economic opportunities by lessening property taxes and removing properties from consideration for residential development because developers and homeowners see being close to large transmission lines as a negative. (W-1-6; W-1-7)
- Negative impacts to future economic development should also be analyzed with impacts from the stigma resulting from the aesthetic changes to the desert. (W-1-16; W-7-2)

### 3.2.2 Economic (non-market) Values

#### 3.2.2.1 Consumer Surplus Value of Recreation

- Be a driver for the community (YPG, residents, seasonal users, AGFD) to develop beneficial collaborative projects and communication. (R-10; W-7-3)
- To make matters worse, many tourists will chose to stay away from recreational areas crisscrossed by large transmission line since it is the pristine desert environment that attracts these visitors. (W-1-13)
- The most significant overt impact of the Ten West Transmission line is the visual impact upon Quartzsite’s pristine desert’s natural beauty. As stated, the vast population which comes to Quartzsite in the winter is here to enjoy the undisturbed beauty of the local desert. (W-10-3)
3.2.2 **Ecosystem Services**

- Unique environment (asset). (G-2)
- Maintaining/finding balance (approving development) between access/preservation. (G-3)

3.2.3 **Social Values**

3.2.3.1 **Quality of Life**

- Concerns about the potential deterioration of recreation resources and loss of access to them. (i.e., Tourism/visitors (social and economic). (G-1) Loss of wildlife and habitat/fragmentation. Impacting visitors/hunters/other users (local and other) E.J. (G-9)
- Discussion of project positives - including reinforcement of aging grid infrastructure. Black/brown-outs. (Statistics/etc.). (O-2; W-5-2; W-6-4)
- Impacts to recreational riders and recreational trails. (Peace Trail and other existing trails and riding areas.) (Y-4)
- There should be a net gain to the recreational trails in the region. (Y-7)
- Perception that project will result in recreational trails closures. (Plomosa Road mentioned specifically). (Y-8; W-6-7)
- Johnson Canyon- No closure of Peace Trail through Johnson Canyon. (Y-9)
- Proactive promotion of no negative impacts of line and positive benefits of the project to recreational use. (Y-10)
- Quality of life choices (ATV, hunt, fish, camp). (R-2)
- Emotional attachment to views, lifestyle, and resistance to change. (B-4)
- Concern about proximity to Quartzsite of I-10 parallel route (i.e., impacts to views, visual resources). (R-7)
- The nature of these impacts will include potential threats to health and safety, effects on community infrastructure, social conflict, changes to local government from economic and social dislocation, and alterations in community social structures caused by the long-term nature of Ten West Link. (W-1-1)

3.2.3.2 **Environmental Justice**

- Due to local environment justice conditions, impacts to this area are greater. (G-10)
- Benefits to the public are outside of the local region where direct/indirect impacts are occurring. The market is not working to quantify those impacts on residents. (G-11; G-12)
3.2.3.3 Health and Safety

- Potential impact to human health. (G-7; W-1-1)

- Concern about proximity to Quartzsite of I-10 parallel route (i.e., health impacts of transmission-lines). (B-4; W-6-5)

- Large transmission lines are the source of serious health concerns, real or imagined. The public expresses high levels of aversion to such hazards, which leads to quality of life issues. (W-1-2; W-1-3)

- A transmission line that covers almost one hundred miles of probably rough terrain will require extensive search and rescue personnel preparation in the event that workers are hurt or harmed. It will mean purchasing aircraft to access difficult areas and training forces to provide services to difficult to reach locations. (W-1-15)

- The Developer stated that there is a potential to place solar panel facilities near the power lines and emphasized that this might be a positive economic value for the area. However, any solar panels near the drop zones would be a hazard to our developmental parachute jumpers and aircrew; therefore, we would object based on the safety factors related to these operations. (W-9-4)
4.0 ISSUE IDENTIFICATION

No significant new issues were raised during the Workshop and comment period that had not been raised previously, during scoping. However, participants elaborated on multiple issues and discussed many issue in the context of their potential impact on the economics of the affected areas. For example, where impacts to wildlife were raised as an issue during scoping, during the Workshop the effect of negative impacts was raised as a potential loss to the tourism economy of the study area.

5.0 REFERENCES


APPENDIX 1
INVITATION LETTER; INVITATION MAILING LIST; AND WORKSHOP ATTENDEES
Dear,

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Yuma Field Office cordially invites you to participate in an Economic Strategies Workshop (Workshop) for the proposed Ten West Link 500 kilovolt (kV) transmission line project (Project). This workshop is scheduled for June 14, 2016 from 12:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. at the Quartzsite Senior Center, 40 S. Moon Mountain Ave., Quartzsite, Arizona 85346.

The Economic Strategies Workshop is part of the process needed for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Project. The Workshop provides an opportunity for local and regional businesses, governments, and community organizations to discuss economic and social conditions and issues that may result from the proposed Project. This Workshop is focused on economic and social topics related to the Ten West Link Project only.

We ask that you consider the following questions in preparing for the workshop:

- What are some important social, environmental, and economic issues, values, and concerns of your community?
- Generally, what social and economic effects do you anticipate the proposed project having on your community? Can these be captured using existing data?
- Are there specific route alternatives or BLM management actions associated with the proposed project that may result in significant social and economic effects on your community?
- What are some partnership/collaboration opportunities that could result from this project between BLM and your community/industry/organization?
- Are there any key geographic areas and/or industries that should be examined in greater detail for potential social and economic impacts?
- Are there key data sources that should be included in any social and economic analyses?
- Who are the people or organizations we should be talking with about this proposed project and its social and economic impacts?
An agenda for the Economic Strategies Workshop is enclosed. We also ask that you RSVP, if possible, by June 7, 2016.

A two (2) week comment period will follow the Economic Strategies Workshop during which you may submit comments, concerns, or documentation you would like the agency to consider in the EIS analysis. Comments should be postmarked by June 28, 2016. You may submit your comments by one of the following methods:

- Submit your written comments directly at the Economic Strategies Workshop;
- Submit your comments electronically via email by sending them to blm_az_azso_10WestLink@blm.gov;
- Mail comments to Ten West Link Project, c/o Joe Incardine, BLM Arizona State Office, One North Central Avenue, Ste. 800; Phoenix, AZ 85004; or
- Fax comments to Ten West Link Project, c/o Joe Incardine, (602) 417-9452.

DCR Transmission, LLC (DCRT) filed a right-of-way (ROW) application with the BLM on September 14, 2015. DCRT proposes to construct, operate, and maintain the Project. The Project would connect the Delaney Substation west of Tonopah, Arizona and the Colorado River Substation west of Blythe, California. The total length of the proposed Project is 114 miles with approximately 97 miles in Arizona and 17 miles in California. Of the total length, 83 miles are on public land; the majority of the public land crossed would be in Arizona. While the proposed route largely follows the existing Southern California Edison Devers-Palo Verde 500kV transmission line in an established utility corridor, there are a number of utility corridors and potential alternative route segments in the study area. Additional alternatives are being developed now as part of the alternatives analysis process.

The BLM’s decisions are to approve, deny, or approve with modifications the proposed Project; and to determine whether to amend the Yuma RMP. Because a portion of the Project would be in California, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) is also required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to issue its own decision on that portion of the Project in California. The CPUC will serve as a cooperating agency and will ensure that the EIS also meets the requirements of CEQA. Additional related decisions will likely be required by other agencies.

To RSVP or if you have any questions about the Project, please contact the BLM National Project Manager, Joe Incardine, at (801) 560-7135, or jincardi@blm.gov. If you require special accommodations at the Economic Strategies Workshop, please contact Ellen Carr at Galileo Project, at (480) 629-4705, or ellen.carr@galileoaz.com.

We appreciate your participation in this proposed Project.

Sincerely,

John MacDonald
Field Manager

Enclosure
Social and Economic Issues Workshop Agenda

Ten West Link Project

Date: June 14, 2016 12:30-5:00pm (AZ)

Location: Quartzsite Senior Center, 40 N Moon Mountain Ave, Quartzsite, AZ 85346

12:30 pm WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

- Ground Rules
- Introductions

PURPOSE OF THE WORKSHOP

- Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Need for Resource Management Plan (RMP) Amendment
- Ten West Link Project Update
- Workshop Goals and Objectives:
  - Identify and clarify economic and social issues;
  - Focus on local perceptions of social and economic concerns

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

- EIS area of analysis
- Proposed Project Construction and Maintenance Activities

SUMMARY OF SCOPING AND ALTERNATIVES

- Scoping results
- Preliminary alternatives

SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE DATA

- Existing socioeconomic conditions and trends in the area of analysis
- Locations and types of possible environmental justice populations
- Currently identified social and economic issues

2:45 pm BREAK
PARTICIPANT DISCUSSION SESSION

- Identify social issues and values for area communities
- Identify social and economic opportunities and constraints
- Identify possible collaboration opportunities

DISCUSSION REPORT OUT TO GROUP

Next Steps / Wrap-up

5:00pm ADJOURN

POTENTIAL DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

- What are some important social, environmental, and economic issues, values, and concerns of your community?
- Generally, what social and economic effects do you anticipate the proposed project having on your community? Can these be captured using existing data?
- Are there specific route alternatives or BLM management actions associated with the proposed project that may result in significant social and economic effects on your community?
- What are some partnership/collaboration opportunities that could result from this project between BLM and your community/industry/organization?
- Are there any key geographic areas and/or industries that should be examined in greater detail for potential social and economic impacts?
- Are there key data sources that should be included in any social and economic analyses?
- Who are the other people or organizations we should be talking with about this proposed project and its social and economic impacts?
- Other comments/questions?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Address 1</th>
<th>Address 2</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Brake</td>
<td>Chair / Grazing</td>
<td>AZ Resource Advisory Council</td>
<td>5225 E Pershing Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scottsdale</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>de Vos</td>
<td>Governor's Representative, AGFD</td>
<td>AZ Resource Advisory Council</td>
<td>5000 W Carefree Highway</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Dawn</td>
<td>Hubbs</td>
<td>Archaeology/History</td>
<td>AZ Resource Advisory Council</td>
<td>P.O. Box 793</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peach Springs</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>86434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Hulen</td>
<td>Archaeology/History</td>
<td>AZ Resource Advisory Council</td>
<td>6625 S McKemy Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Drew</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Public-at-Large</td>
<td>AZ Resource Advisory Council</td>
<td>2305 Branding Iron Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td>Safford</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>Marsh</td>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>AZ Resource Advisory Council</td>
<td>School of Natural Resources &amp; the Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Mandy</td>
<td>Metzger</td>
<td>Coconino County Supervisor</td>
<td>AZ Resource Advisory Council</td>
<td>P.O. Box 31239</td>
<td></td>
<td>Flagstaff</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>86003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Krishna</td>
<td>Parameswaran</td>
<td>Energy &amp; Minerals</td>
<td>AZ Resource Advisory Council</td>
<td>34365 N 96th Way</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scottsdale</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Quigley</td>
<td>Water &amp; Healthy Landscapes</td>
<td>AZ Resource Advisory Council</td>
<td>5469 S Thunder Sky Way</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Maggie</td>
<td>Sacher</td>
<td>Vice-Chair / Commercial Recreation</td>
<td>AZ Resource Advisory Council</td>
<td>HC 67 Box 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marble Canyon</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>86036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>J.C.</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td>OHV / Developed Recreation</td>
<td>AZ Resource Advisory Council</td>
<td>P.O. Box 2211</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bouse</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Mica</td>
<td>Schotborgh</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>AZ Resource Advisory Council</td>
<td>555 E Suffolk Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Emmett</td>
<td>Sturgill</td>
<td>Grazing</td>
<td>AZ Resource Advisory Council</td>
<td>12375 N Holstein Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kingman</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>86409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Tenney</td>
<td>Dispersed Recreation</td>
<td>AZ Resource Advisory Council</td>
<td>6792 Chaney Ranch Loop</td>
<td></td>
<td>Show Low</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Trussell</td>
<td>Public-at-Large</td>
<td>AZ Resource Advisory Council</td>
<td>312 S Hardy Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Watson</td>
<td>Mohave County Supervisor</td>
<td>AZ Resource Advisory Council</td>
<td>1285 Franklin Court</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kingman</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>86401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Incardine</td>
<td>National Project Manager</td>
<td>Bureau of Land Management</td>
<td>8945 S Rockwell Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>84093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>Nadeau</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Federal Highways Administraton</td>
<td>1200 New Jersey Ave, S.E.</td>
<td>E87-314</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>20590-9898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title/Position</td>
<td>Organization/Office Address</td>
<td>City/State Zip Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Judith Movilla</td>
<td>Community Planner</td>
<td>Joshua Tree National Park 74485 National Park Drive</td>
<td>Twentynine Palms</td>
<td>CA 92277</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonel Randy Murray</td>
<td>Commander</td>
<td>U.S. Army - Yuma Proving Ground 301 C Street</td>
<td>Yuma AZ 85365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. William Miller</td>
<td>Regulatory Division</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1636 N Central Ave Suite 900</td>
<td>Twentynine Palms</td>
<td>CA 92277</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Brian Bowker</td>
<td>Western Regional Director</td>
<td>U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs 2600 North Central Ave 4th Floor Mailroom</td>
<td>Phoenix AZ 85012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Rodney McVey</td>
<td>Deputy Regional Director, Western Regional Office</td>
<td>U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs 2600 North Central Ave 13th Floor Mailroom</td>
<td>Phoenix AZ 85004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Terry Fulp</td>
<td>Lower CO Regional Director</td>
<td>U.S. Bureau of Reclamation P.O. Box 61470</td>
<td>Boulder City NV 89006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Maria Ramirez</td>
<td>Area Manager</td>
<td>U.S. Bureau of Reclamation - Yuma Area Office 7301 Calle Agua Salada</td>
<td>Yuma AZ 85364</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jason Gerdes</td>
<td>Area Manager</td>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Pacific-Southwest Office: Region 9 75 Hawthorne Street</td>
<td>San Francisco CA 94105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Elaine Johnson</td>
<td>Area Manager</td>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - Kofa National Wildlife Refuge 9300 E 28th Street</td>
<td>Yuma AZ 85365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Greg Risdahl</td>
<td>Refuge Manager</td>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - Kofa National Wildlife Refuge 9300 E 28th Street</td>
<td>Yuma AZ 85365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ren Lohoefener</td>
<td>Regional Director</td>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - Region B: Pacific Southwest 2800 Cottage Way W-2606</td>
<td>Sacramento CA 95825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mark A. Gabriel</td>
<td>Administrator and CEO</td>
<td>Western Area Power Administration P.O. Box 281213</td>
<td>Lakewood CO 80228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Wieringa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Western Area Power Administration P.O. Box 281213</td>
<td>Lakewood CO 80228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Address 1</td>
<td>Address 2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Zip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Bitter</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Arizona Corporation Commission-Commissioners Wing</td>
<td>1200 W Washington</td>
<td>2nd Floor</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>Smith-Reeve</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Arizona Department of Emergency Management</td>
<td>5636 E McDowell Road</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Misael</td>
<td>Cabrera</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Arizona Department of Environmental Quality</td>
<td>1110 W Washington</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Bret</td>
<td>Parke</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Arizona Department of Environmental Quality</td>
<td>1110 W Washington</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>John S.</td>
<td>Halikowski</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Arizona Department of Mines and Mineral Resources</td>
<td>1520 W Adams Street</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Patane</td>
<td>SW District Engineer</td>
<td>Arizona Department of Transportation</td>
<td>2243 E Gila Ridge Road</td>
<td>Yuma</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Buschatzke</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Arizona Department of Water Resources</td>
<td>3550 N Central Avenue</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Knowles</td>
<td>Region IV Habitat Program Manager</td>
<td>Arizona Game and Fish Department</td>
<td>5000 W Carefree Highway</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85086</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>Sonny</td>
<td>Borrelli</td>
<td>District 5</td>
<td>Arizona Governor’s Office</td>
<td>1700 W Washington Street</td>
<td>Room 113</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>Regina</td>
<td>Cobb</td>
<td>District 5</td>
<td>Arizona Legislature</td>
<td>1700 W Washington Street</td>
<td>Room 335</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Donahue</td>
<td>District 5</td>
<td>Arizona Legislature</td>
<td>1700 W Washington Street</td>
<td>Room 304</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>Darin</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>District 13</td>
<td>Arizona Legislature</td>
<td>1700 W Washington Street</td>
<td>Room 313</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>District 13</td>
<td>Arizona Legislation</td>
<td>1700 W Washington Street</td>
<td>Room 208</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator</td>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Shooter</td>
<td>District 13</td>
<td>Arizona Legislation</td>
<td>1700 W Washington Street</td>
<td>Room 200</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Tenney</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Arizona Residential Utility Consumer</td>
<td>1110 W Washington</td>
<td>Suite 220</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Micah</td>
<td>Horowitz</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Arizona State Land Department</td>
<td>1616 W Adams Street</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Rees</td>
<td>Project Leader</td>
<td>Arizona State Land Department</td>
<td>1616 W Adams Street</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Arizona State Parks</td>
<td>1300 W Washington Street</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Bob Sejkora, Arizona State Parks, 23751 N 23rd Suite 190, Phoenix, AZ 85085

Mr. Theodore Cooke, General Manager, Central Arizona Project, P.O. Box 43020, Phoenix, AZ 85080

Mr. Rick Warren, General Manager, Harquahala Valley Irrigation District, 402 S Harquahala Valley Road, Tonopah, AZ 85354

Mr. Daniel Field, County Administrator, La Paz County, 1108 Joshua Avenue, Parker, AZ 85344

Mr. Theodore Cooke, General Manager, Central Arizona Project, P.O. Box 43020, Phoenix, AZ 85080

Mr. Rick Warren, General Manager, Harquahala Valley Irrigation District, 402 S Harquahala Valley Road, Tonopah, AZ 85354

Mr. Daniel Field, County Administrator, La Paz County, 1108 Joshua Avenue, Parker, AZ 85344

Ms. Nora Yackley, Community Development Manager, La Paz County Community Development Department, 1112 Joshua Avenue Suite 202, Parker, AZ 85344

Mr. Alex Taft, Community Resource Director, La Paz County Enterprise Zone Commission, 1112 Joshua Avenue, Parker, AZ 85344

Mr. Steve Biro, Director, La Paz County Office of Emergency Management, 1108 Joshua Avenue, Parker, AZ 85344


Mr. Eric Anderson, Transportation Director, Maricopa Association of Governments, 303 N 1st Avenue #300, Phoenix, AZ 85003

Mr. Tim Strow, Sr. Transportation Project Manager, Maricopa Association of Governments, 303 N 1st Avenue #300, Phoenix, AZ 85003

Supervisor Steve Gallardo, District 5, Maricopa County, 301 W Jefferson Street 10th Floor, Phoenix, AZ 85003

Supervisor Clint L. Hickman, District 4, Maricopa County, 301 W Jefferson Street 10th Floor, Phoenix, AZ 85003

Mr. Phillip McNeely, Director, Maricopa County Air Quality Department, 1001 N Central Avenue Suite 125, Phoenix, AZ 85004

Kelly Roy, Utility Coordination Branch Manager, Maricopa County Department of Transportation, 2901 W Durango Street, Phoenix, AZ 85009

Ms. Jennifer Toth, Transportation Director, Maricopa County Department of Transportation, 2901 W Durango Street, Phoenix, AZ 85009

Mr. Ken Saline, Mayor, Tonopah Irrigation District, P.O. Box 1267, Mesa, AZ 85211

Mayor Jackie A. Meck, Mayor, Town of Buckeye, 530 E Monroe Avenue, Buckeye, AZ 85326

Mayor Chuck Turner, Mayor, Town of Gila Bend, 644 W Pima St, Gila Bend, AZ 85337

Mayor Dan Beaver, Mayor, Town of Parker, 1314 11th Street, Parker, AZ 85344

Mayor Ed Foster, Mayor, Town of Quartzsite, P.O. Box 2812, Quartzsite, AZ 85346

Congressman Trent Franks, District 8, U.S. House of Representatives, 7121 W Bell Road Ste 200, Glendale, AZ 85308
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Office Address</th>
<th>Suite</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congressman</td>
<td>Ruben Gallego</td>
<td>District 7</td>
<td>U.S. House of Representatives 411 N Central Avenue</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressman</td>
<td>Paul Gosar</td>
<td>District 7</td>
<td>U.S. House of Representatives One City Plaza</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Yuma</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressman</td>
<td>Raul Grijalva</td>
<td>District 7</td>
<td>U.S. House of Representatives 738 N 5th Avenue</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congresswoman</td>
<td>Ann Kirkpatrick</td>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>U.S. House of Representatives 211 N Florence Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Casa Grande</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congresswoman</td>
<td>Martha McSally</td>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>U.S. House of Representatives 4400 E Broadway Blvd</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressman</td>
<td>Matt Salmon</td>
<td>District 5</td>
<td>U.S. House of Representatives 207 N Gilbert Road</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>Gilbert</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressman</td>
<td>David Schweikert</td>
<td>District 6</td>
<td>U.S. House of Representatives 10603 N Hayden Road</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Scottsdale</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congresswoman</td>
<td>Kirsten Sinema</td>
<td>District 9</td>
<td>U.S. House of Representatives 2944 W 44th Street</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator</td>
<td>Jeff Flake</td>
<td>District 9</td>
<td>U.S. Senate 2200 E Camelback Road</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator</td>
<td>John McCain</td>
<td>District 9</td>
<td>U.S. Senate 2201 E Camelback Road</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Russ Clark</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>Yuma County 198 S Main Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yuma</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Roger Patterson</td>
<td>County Engineer</td>
<td>Yuma County Department of Development Services 2351 W 26th Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yuma</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Charlene FitzGerald</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Yuma Metropolitan Planning Organization 502 Orange Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yuma</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Address 1</td>
<td>Address 2</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>Raul</td>
<td>Ruiz</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>CA State Assembly (District 36)</td>
<td>43875 Washington Street</td>
<td>Suite F</td>
<td>Palm Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>Eduardo</td>
<td>Garcia</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>CA State Assembly (District 56)</td>
<td>48220 Jackson Street</td>
<td>#A3</td>
<td>Coachella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator</td>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Senator</td>
<td>CA State Senate (District 28)</td>
<td>45-125 Smurr Street</td>
<td>Suite B</td>
<td>Indio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Stacey</td>
<td>Crowley</td>
<td>Director, Regional Affairs</td>
<td>CAISO</td>
<td>250 Outcropping Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Debi</td>
<td>LeVine</td>
<td>Director of Systems Operations</td>
<td>CAISO</td>
<td>P.O. Box 639014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorable</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td>California Assembly, District 71</td>
<td>10152 Mission Gorge Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Dana Bart</td>
<td>Fisher, Jr.</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>California Colorado River Board</td>
<td>770 Fairmont Avenue</td>
<td>#100</td>
<td>Glendale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Charlton H.</td>
<td>Bonham</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td>1416 9th Street</td>
<td>12th Floor</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Kinney</td>
<td>Sr. Environmental Scientist</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td>407 W Line Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Vigil</td>
<td>Sr Environmental Scientist, CO River Program</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td>P.O. Box 2160</td>
<td></td>
<td>Blythe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Malcolm</td>
<td>Dougherty</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>California Department of Transportation</td>
<td>1120 N Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Mark W.</td>
<td>Cowin</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>California Department of Water Resources</td>
<td>1416 9th Street</td>
<td>Room 1115-1</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Weisenmiller</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>California Energy Commission</td>
<td>1516 Ninth Street</td>
<td>MS-33</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Director of Environmental Affairs</td>
<td>California Farm Bureau Federation</td>
<td>2300 River Plaza Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Baylis</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>California Fish and Game Commission</td>
<td>1416 Ninth Street</td>
<td>Ste 1320</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Gomez</td>
<td>Tribal Advisor</td>
<td>California Governor’s Office of the Tribal Advisor</td>
<td>1550 Harbor Blvd.</td>
<td>Ste 100</td>
<td>West Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Mary Jo</td>
<td>Borak</td>
<td>Infrastructure, Permitting, &amp; CEQA</td>
<td>California Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>505 Van Ness Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title and Office</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Zip Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Eric Chiang</td>
<td>Project Representative</td>
<td>California Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>505 Van Ness Avenue, 4th Floor</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA 94102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Jennifer Lucchesi</td>
<td>Executive Officer</td>
<td>California State Lands Commission</td>
<td>100 Howe Avenue, Ste 100 South</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA 95825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Lisa Mangat</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>California State Parks</td>
<td>1416 9th Street</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA 95814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorable Ben Hueso</td>
<td></td>
<td>California State Senate, District 40</td>
<td>45-125 Smurr Street, Suite B</td>
<td>Indio</td>
<td>CA 92201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John P. Donnelly</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>California Wildlife Conservation Board</td>
<td>1416 9th Street, Room 1266</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA 95814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Rebecca Forbes</td>
<td>District 8</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>464 W 4th Street, Mail Station 722</td>
<td>San Bernadino</td>
<td>CA 92401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Mike Evans</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>City of Blythe</td>
<td>235 N Broadway</td>
<td>Blythe</td>
<td>CA 92225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert Perdue</td>
<td>Executive Officer</td>
<td>Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board</td>
<td>73-720 Fred Waring Drive, Suite 100</td>
<td>Palm Desert</td>
<td>CA 92260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Alan DeSalvio</td>
<td>Deputy Director, Mojave Desert Operations</td>
<td>Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District</td>
<td>14306 Park Avenue</td>
<td>Victorville</td>
<td>CA 92392</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ned Hyduke</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Palo Verde Irrigation District</td>
<td>180 W 14th Avenue</td>
<td>Blythe</td>
<td>CA 92225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Kimberly Barraza</td>
<td>Scheduler</td>
<td>Representative Eduardo Garcia</td>
<td>48220 Jackson Street, #A3</td>
<td>Coachella</td>
<td>CA 92236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Juan C. Perez</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Riverside County Department of Building and Safety</td>
<td>4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>CA 92502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Warren &quot;Dusty&quot; Williams</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District</td>
<td>1995 Market Street</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>CA 92501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Idyllwild Nature Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>Riverside County Regional Park and Open Space Dist.</td>
<td>25225 Highway 243</td>
<td>Idyllwild</td>
<td>CA 92549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Glenn Miller</td>
<td>District 28 Director</td>
<td>Senator Jeff Stone's Office</td>
<td>State Capitol, Room 4062</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA 95814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The addresses provided are for the respective offices or mailing addresses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization/Agency</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Arnold San Miguel</td>
<td>San Bernadino County Regional Office</td>
<td>Southern California Association of Governments</td>
<td>1170 W 3rd Street Suite 140</td>
<td>San Bernadino</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Cesar Diaz</td>
<td>Deputy Legislative Director</td>
<td>State Building &amp; Construction Trades Council of California</td>
<td>1231 I Street Suite 302</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor Jerry Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td>State of California</td>
<td>State Capitol Ste 1173</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Steven Weiss</td>
<td>Planning Director</td>
<td>Transportation &amp; Land Management Agency (TLMA)</td>
<td>4080 Lemon Street 12th Floor</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorable Duncan Hunter</td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. House of Representatives, District 50</td>
<td>1611 N Magnolia Ave Suite 310</td>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Barbara Boxer</td>
<td>Senator</td>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
<td>501 I Street Suite 7-600</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Dianne Feinstein</td>
<td>Senator</td>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
<td>One Post Street Suite 2450</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorable Barbara Boxer</td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
<td>3403 10th Street Suite 704</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorable Dianne Feinstein</td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. Senate</td>
<td>11111 Santa Monica Blvd. Suite 915</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>90025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Vikki Dee Bradshaw</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California</td>
<td>700 N Alameda Street</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>90012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Address 1</td>
<td>Address 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Jeff L.</td>
<td>Grubbe</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians</td>
<td>5401 Dinah Shore Drive</td>
<td>Palm Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Louis J.</td>
<td>Manuel, Jr.</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Ak Chin Indian Community of the Maricopa Indian Reservation</td>
<td>42507 W Peters and Nell Road</td>
<td>Maricopa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Vance</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Augustine Band of Cahuilla Indians</td>
<td>PO Box 846</td>
<td>Coachella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Limon-Saldivar</td>
<td>Tribal Government Affairs Manager</td>
<td>Augustine Band of Cahuilla Indians</td>
<td>PO Box 846</td>
<td>Coachella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>Welmas</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Cabazon Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>84-245 Indio Springs Drive</td>
<td>Indio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Edward D.</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Chemehuevi Tribe of the Chemehuevi Indian Reservation</td>
<td>PO Box 1976</td>
<td>Havasu Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Cravath</td>
<td>Director, Cultural Center</td>
<td>Chemehuevi Tribe of the Chemehuevi Indian Reservation</td>
<td>PO Box 1976</td>
<td>Havasu Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairwoman</td>
<td>Sherry</td>
<td>Cordavath</td>
<td>Chairwoman</td>
<td>Cocopah Tribe of AZ</td>
<td>14515 S Veterans Drive</td>
<td>Somerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Patch</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Colorado River Indian Tribes of the Colorado River Indian Reservation</td>
<td>26600 Mohave Road</td>
<td>Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Harper</td>
<td>Tribal Historic Preservation Officer</td>
<td>Colorado River Indian Tribes of the Colorado River Indian Reservation</td>
<td>26600 Mohave Road</td>
<td>Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Ruben</td>
<td>Balderas</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation</td>
<td>PO Box 17779</td>
<td>Fountain Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>Language/Cultural Coordinator</td>
<td>Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation</td>
<td>PO Box 17779</td>
<td>Fountain Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Erika</td>
<td>McCalvin</td>
<td>Community Planner</td>
<td>Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation</td>
<td>PO Box 17779</td>
<td>Fountain Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>Carole Cole</td>
<td>Klopatek</td>
<td>Director of Government Relations</td>
<td>Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation</td>
<td>PO Box 17779</td>
<td>Fountain Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Fort Mojave Tribe of AZ</td>
<td>500 Merriman Avenue</td>
<td>Needles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Otero</td>
<td>Director, Aha Makav Cultural Society</td>
<td>Fort Mojave Tribe of AZ</td>
<td>10225 S. Harbor Avenue</td>
<td>Unit 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Jackson, Sr.</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Indian Reservation</td>
<td>PO Box 1899</td>
<td>Yuma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Willa</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Chairwoman, Culture Committee</td>
<td>Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Indian Reservation</td>
<td>PO Box 1899</td>
<td>Yuma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Roe Lewis</td>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>Gila River Indian Community of the Gila River Indian Reservation</td>
<td>PO Box 97</td>
<td>Sacaton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Herman G.</td>
<td>Honanie</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Hopi Tribe of AZ</td>
<td>PO Box 123</td>
<td>Kykotsmovi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Tribal Chairman</td>
<td>Morongo Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>12700 Pumarra Road</td>
<td>Banning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Delbert</td>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community of the Salt River Reservation</td>
<td>10005 East Osborn Road</td>
<td>Scottsdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Valbuena</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>San Manuel Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>26569 Community Center Drive</td>
<td>Highland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairwoman</td>
<td>Rosemary</td>
<td>Morillo</td>
<td>Chairwoman</td>
<td>Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians</td>
<td>PO Box 487</td>
<td>San Jacinto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Mary L.</td>
<td>Resvaloso</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians</td>
<td>PO Box 1160</td>
<td>Thermal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Tisha</td>
<td>Vega</td>
<td>Planning Department Assistant</td>
<td>Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians</td>
<td>PO Box 1160</td>
<td>Thermal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Darrell</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Spokesman</td>
<td>Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>46-200 Harrison Place</td>
<td>Coachella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Address 1</td>
<td>Address 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Vince Brunasso</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Agricultural Council of California</td>
<td>1121 L Street #304</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Western State Policy Director</td>
<td>American Wind Energy Association</td>
<td>1501 M Street NW Suite 1000</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Steve Arnquist</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Anza Trail Foundation</td>
<td>1180 Eugenia Place Suite 220</td>
<td>Carpinteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Rob Sargent</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Arizona Assoc for Economic Development</td>
<td>3033 N Central Avenue #615</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Tim Stephens</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Arizona Assoc of Counties</td>
<td>1910 W Jefferson Street</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Kelly Norton</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Arizona Commerce Authority</td>
<td>333 N Central Avenue #1900</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Jeannie Gillen</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Arizona Hispanic Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>255 E Osborn Road #201</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Nancy Meister</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Arizona Mining Assn</td>
<td>916 W Adams Street</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Douglas Ross</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Arizona Peace Trail</td>
<td>P.O. Box 1845</td>
<td>Quartzsite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Greg Suba</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Arizona Peace Trail</td>
<td>P.O. Box 878</td>
<td>Bouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Kris Randall</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Arizona Riparian Council</td>
<td>P.O. Box 875402</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Jim Bedore</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Arizona Roamers Buggy Club</td>
<td>13221 N 19th Place</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Chuck Nisbet</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Arizona Rock Products Association</td>
<td>916 W Adams</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Douglas Nelson</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Arizona Rural Water Assn</td>
<td>7000 N 6th Street Suite 12</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Becky Antle</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Arizona ST Assn of 4WD Club</td>
<td>P.O. Box 23904</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Bruce Fuller</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Arizona Sunriders</td>
<td>1869 E Sage Hen Ct.</td>
<td>Meridian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Zip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert A. Witzeman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arizona Sunriders ATV Club</td>
<td>PO Box 5054</td>
<td>Quartzsite AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>85359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jeff Schmidt</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Arizona Trail Association</td>
<td>P.O. Box 36736</td>
<td>Phoenix AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>85067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Lauren Scheller</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arizona Trail Riders</td>
<td>P.O. Box 31877</td>
<td>Phoenix AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>85046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Pete Markman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arizona Trail Riders Assn</td>
<td>P.O. Box 31877</td>
<td>Phoenix AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>85046-1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Barbara Hawke</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Arizona Wilderness Coalition</td>
<td>P.O. Box 40340</td>
<td>Tucson AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>85717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Mylon Filkins</td>
<td></td>
<td>Backcountry Horsemens of America</td>
<td>4408 Wible Road</td>
<td>Bakersfield CA</td>
<td>93313-2642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Kevin Emmerich</td>
<td></td>
<td>Basin and Range Watch</td>
<td>P.O. Box 70</td>
<td>Beatty NV</td>
<td></td>
<td>89003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Grounds</td>
<td></td>
<td>Black Mountain Outfitters</td>
<td>P.O. Box 4118</td>
<td>Kingman AZ</td>
<td>86402-4118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Bernadette Del Chiaro</td>
<td></td>
<td>Blythe Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>207 E Hobsonway</td>
<td>Blythe CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>9225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jim Shipley</td>
<td></td>
<td>Blythe Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>207 E Hobsonway</td>
<td>Blythe CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>9225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Julie Hayden</td>
<td></td>
<td>Blythe Riding Club -- Happy Hoofers</td>
<td>19975 S Intake Blvd</td>
<td>Blythe CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>92225-9250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bouse C of C</td>
<td>P.O. Box 817</td>
<td>Bouse AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>85325-0817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Brandon Tooley</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bouse Ghost Riders</td>
<td>P.O. Box 878</td>
<td>Bouse AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>85325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. William Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bouse Ghost Riders</td>
<td>5774 Yukon Drive</td>
<td>Sun Valley NV</td>
<td></td>
<td>89433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Dana Rochat</td>
<td></td>
<td>California Desert Coalition</td>
<td>P.O. Box 1508</td>
<td>Yucca Valley CA</td>
<td>92286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legislative Director</td>
<td>California Labor Federation</td>
<td>1127 11th Street</td>
<td>Sacramento CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>California Solar Energy Industries</td>
<td>1107 9th Street</td>
<td>Sacramento CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Kevin Dahl</td>
<td></td>
<td>California Wilderness Coalition</td>
<td>1814 Franklin St</td>
<td>Oakland CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>94612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Campesinos Sin Fronteras</td>
<td>600 N 2nd Ave</td>
<td>San Luis AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>85349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Ileen Anderson</td>
<td>Public Lands Desert Director</td>
<td>Center for Biological Diversity</td>
<td>8033 Sunset Boulevard #447</td>
<td>Los Angeles CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>90046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chicanos Por La Causa</td>
<td>1112 E. Buckeye Rd.</td>
<td>Phoenix AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>85034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Charles Grotke</td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Blythe</td>
<td>8401 E Hobsonway</td>
<td>Blythe CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>92225-2113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. David Petritz</td>
<td>Development Svcs Dept</td>
<td>City of Blythe</td>
<td>235 N Broadway</td>
<td>Blythe CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>92226-1609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert Crain</td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Blythe</td>
<td>220 N Spring Street</td>
<td>Blythe CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>92225-1635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Larry Liguori</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Coachella Valley Mountains Conservancy</td>
<td>73-710 Fred Waring Drive</td>
<td>Palm Desert CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>92260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Dana Freshwater</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection</td>
<td>300 E University Blvd #120</td>
<td>Tucson AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>85705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jack Barnet</td>
<td>Colo River Basin Salinity Control Forum</td>
<td>106 W 500 S</td>
<td>Suite 101</td>
<td>Bountiful</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>84010-6203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Phil Lehr</td>
<td>Colorado River Commission</td>
<td>555 E Washington Street</td>
<td>Suite 3100</td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>89101-1065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Gary Kania</td>
<td>Congressional Sportsmen’s Foundation</td>
<td>110 N Carolina Ave SE</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>20003-1841</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John Jackson</td>
<td>Conservation Force</td>
<td>3240 S I-10 Servcie Road W</td>
<td>Suite 200</td>
<td>Metairie</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>70001-6911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert Peters</td>
<td>Sr. Representative, SW Office</td>
<td>Defenders of Wildlife</td>
<td>100 N Stone Ave</td>
<td>Suite 807</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Gavin Purchas</td>
<td>Desert Bicycle Club</td>
<td>P.O. Box 13382</td>
<td>Palm Desert</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Douglas Evans</td>
<td>Desert Trails Coalition</td>
<td>2439 S Calle Palo Fierro</td>
<td>Palm Springs</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Thomas Hulen</td>
<td>Desert Trails Coalition</td>
<td>70590 Camella Court</td>
<td>Rancho Mirage</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Nick Carter</td>
<td>Earth Resources Mining &amp; Milling</td>
<td>P.O. Box 205</td>
<td>Bouse</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85325</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Darwin Jansen</td>
<td>El Paso Electric Co</td>
<td>P.O. Box 982</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>79999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Garry Zieske</td>
<td>El Paso Natural Gas</td>
<td>7815 S 48th Street</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Patrick Scott</td>
<td>El Paso Natural Gas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Henri Bisson</td>
<td>Sr. Energy Policy Analyst</td>
<td>Environmental Arizona</td>
<td>130 N Central Avenue</td>
<td>Suite 202</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Gary Keller</td>
<td>Director of California Clean Energy</td>
<td>Environmental Defense Fund</td>
<td>123 Mission Street</td>
<td>28th Floor</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Chris Camacho</td>
<td>Greater Phoenix Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>531 N Los Alamos</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Todd Sanders</td>
<td>Greater Phoenix Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>201 N Central Avenue</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Nicholas Adcock</td>
<td>VP/Governmental Affairs Manager</td>
<td>Greater Riverside Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>3985 University Avenue</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>92501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Kemper Brown</td>
<td>K Lazy B Ranch</td>
<td>P.O. Box 753</td>
<td>Yuma</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85365-9793</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Doris Heisler</td>
<td>Maricopa Audubon Society</td>
<td>4619 E Arcadia Lane</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Beth Pratt</td>
<td>Executive Director of California Regional Center</td>
<td>National Wildlife Federation</td>
<td>11100 Wildlife Center Drive</td>
<td>Reston</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>20190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title/Position</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Zip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Dana Bell</td>
<td></td>
<td>National Off-Hwy Consv Council</td>
<td>5764 Campo Walk</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>90803-5035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Helen O'Shea</td>
<td></td>
<td>National Wildlife Federation</td>
<td>303 E 17th Ave Suite 15</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>80203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Walter McTeer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Resources Defense Council</td>
<td>111 Sutter Street 20th Floor</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Lisa Belenky</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rocky Mountains Regional Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Steve Trussel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Director, Western Renewable Energy Project</td>
<td>1634 W Charleston Ave</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Fred Cronk</td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Planning and Conservation League</td>
<td>1107 9th Street #901</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Greg Hiner</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Lands Foundation, Arizona Chapter</td>
<td>3032 N Homestead Place</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Lisa Belenky</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Lands Interpretive Association</td>
<td>6501 Fourth Street NW</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Marilyn McFate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quartzsite Area Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>1217 S California Ave</td>
<td>Quartzsite</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Peter Sauricki</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quartzsite Area Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>1217 S California Ave</td>
<td>Quartzsite</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Howard White</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning and Conservation League</td>
<td>1107 9th Street #901</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Kim Delfino</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Lands Foundation, Arizona Chapter</td>
<td>3032 N Homestead Place</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Reid Haughey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Lands Interpretive Association</td>
<td>6501 Fourth Street NW</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Joe Angerami</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quartzsite Area Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>1217 S California Ave</td>
<td>Quartzsite</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Laura Verdugo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning and Conservation League</td>
<td>1107 9th Street #901</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. William Doelle</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Lands Foundation, Arizona Chapter</td>
<td>3032 N Homestead Place</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Reid Haughey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Lands Interpretive Association</td>
<td>6501 Fourth Street NW</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Joe Angerami</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quartzsite Area Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>1217 S California Ave</td>
<td>Quartzsite</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>85346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Laura Verdugo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning and Conservation League</td>
<td>1107 9th Street #901</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Joyce Grossman</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Society for Range Management, Arizona Section</td>
<td>5290 S Little Drive</td>
<td>Flagstaff</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Ian Dowdy</td>
<td>Director, Sun Corridor Program</td>
<td>Sonoran Institute</td>
<td>11010 N Tatum Blvd</td>
<td>Suite D101</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Jen Marson</td>
<td>Project Director, CA Renewable Energy Initiative</td>
<td>The Nature Conservancy</td>
<td>7600 N 15th Street</td>
<td>Suite 100</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Tom Darin</td>
<td>Project Director, CA Renewable Energy Initiative</td>
<td>The Nature Conservancy</td>
<td>201 Mission Street</td>
<td>Suite D101</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Sandy Bahr</td>
<td>Chapter Director</td>
<td>The Sierra Club Grand Canyon Chapter</td>
<td>314 W Roosevelt Street</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Sydney Hay</td>
<td>Media contact for Arizona</td>
<td>The Sierra Club San Gogonio Chapter</td>
<td>4079 Mission Inn Avenue</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Emily Nottingham</td>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>The Trust for Public Land</td>
<td>AZ State Office,607 Cerrillos Road</td>
<td>Suite F1</td>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Alex Daue</td>
<td>Acquisitions and Projects Manager</td>
<td>The Wildlands Conservancy</td>
<td>39611 Oak Glen Road</td>
<td>Bldg #12</td>
<td>Oak Glen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>John Weisser</td>
<td>Western Lands Project</td>
<td>Western Watersheds Project</td>
<td>738 N. 5th Ave.</td>
<td>Suite 200</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Kris Randall</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Wilderness Land Trust</td>
<td>P.O. Box 1420</td>
<td>Carbondale</td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>George Nickas</td>
<td>Wilderness Watch</td>
<td>P.O. Box 9175</td>
<td>Missoula</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>59807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Douglas Grann</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Wildlife Forever</td>
<td>2700 Freeway Blvd</td>
<td>Suite 1000</td>
<td>Brooklyn Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Peter Cimellaro</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Yellowhorn Outfitters</td>
<td>5118 E Flower Street</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Nancy Meister</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Yuma Audubon Society</td>
<td>P.O. Box 6395</td>
<td>Yuma</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Doug Beach</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>YVRGC</td>
<td>P.O. Box 6500</td>
<td>Yuma</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Carol Stimson</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>YVRGC</td>
<td>P.O. Box 2669</td>
<td>Quartzsite</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Kelly Sarber</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>YVRGC</td>
<td>642 Margarita Ave</td>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs.</td>
<td>Jen</td>
<td>Rouda</td>
<td>VP, Environmental Development</td>
<td>Abengoa T&amp;I</td>
<td>3030 N. Central Ave</td>
<td>Suite 804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Starwood Energy Global</td>
<td>S Greenwich Office Park</td>
<td>Greenwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs.</td>
<td>Cary</td>
<td>Olson</td>
<td>Sr. Project Manager</td>
<td>HDR, Inc.</td>
<td>3200 E Camelback Rd</td>
<td>Suite 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Org</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Ross</td>
<td>Arizona Peace Trail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dross@arizonapeace.org">dross@arizonapeace.org</a></td>
<td>Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Fenske</td>
<td>ADOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:BFenske@azdot.gov">BFenske@azdot.gov</a></td>
<td>Yuma, AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Knoll</td>
<td>ADOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:BKnoll@azdot.gov">BKnoll@azdot.gov</a></td>
<td>Yuma, AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ Clark</td>
<td>Yuma County</td>
<td><a href="mailto:RusstCllark@azdot.gov">RusstCllark@azdot.gov</a></td>
<td>Yuma, AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Sarber</td>
<td>La Paz County</td>
<td><a href="mailto:KellySarber@usgs.gov">KellySarber@usgs.gov</a></td>
<td>La Paz, AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly Firdin</td>
<td>LaPazCo</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hirwind@co.colapaz.az.us">hirwind@co.colapaz.az.us</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Towe</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:PW@SunWestCasing.com">PW@SunWestCasing.com</a></td>
<td>Parker, AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosun Kin</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:erin.coppin@w.wu.edu">erin.coppin@w.wu.edu</a></td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Weise</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:chrisweise@fws.gov">chrisweise@fws.gov</a></td>
<td>Yuma, AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Schuler</td>
<td>LaPazCo</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sschuler@co.colapaz.az.us">sschuler@co.colapaz.az.us</a></td>
<td>Yuma Ave, AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora Yackley</td>
<td>LaPaz County</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Nya@co.colapaz.az.us">Nya@co.colapaz.az.us</a></td>
<td>Joshua Ave, AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Chianto</td>
<td>CPUC</td>
<td>Via Goflow/Cull</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James LeBolt</td>
<td>Yuma County</td>
<td><a href="mailto:JamesLeboll@ymail.com">JamesLeboll@ymail.com</a></td>
<td>Yuma, AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan Cadkins</td>
<td>Copper Stair Consulting Group</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ian@copperstate.gov">ian@copperstate.gov</a></td>
<td>Box 3033, Yuma, AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Wette</td>
<td>City Roadsman</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MarilynWette@usgs.gov">MarilynWette@usgs.gov</a></td>
<td>Yuma, AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denny Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yuma, AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hudecav</td>
<td>Parker Pioneer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pioneer@havasu.az.com">pioneer@havasu.az.com</a></td>
<td>Parker, AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica Timberlake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parker, AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloan Pertro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sloan Pertro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Org</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANFRED SCOTT</td>
<td>Quechan Tribe</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Scottmanfield@yahoo.com">Scottmanfield@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Tucson, AZ 85366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernestina Noriega</td>
<td>Quechan Tribe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Vault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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APPENDIX 2

HANDOUT ON SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC
CONDITIONS; AND WORKSHOP
SLIDESHOW PRESENTATION
### Key Socio-Economic Observations

**La Paz County:**
- declining population and tax base
- rapidly aging population
- total employment below pre-crisis level
- personal income lower than US avg.
- tourism-generated tax revenues

**Maricopa County:**
- higher than average population growth
- younger overall population
- total employment at pre-crisis level
- personal income lower than US avg.
- decreased property values

**Riverside County:**
- slowed population growth
- younger overall population
- unemployment higher than US avg.
- personal income lower than US avg.
- decreased property values

---

### Project Benefits and Goals

- Enhance System Efficiencies
- Improve System Economics
- Enhance Operational Flexibility
- Enhance Access to Diverse Resources
- Facilitate Renewable Energy Development
- Improve Regional Collaboration
- Strengthen Regional Reliability
- Promote Regional Economic Development
- Conserve Resources

---

### TEEB* Ecosystem Services

- Agricultural/Food Provisioning
- Water Regulation
- Habitat Preservation
- Cultural/Amenity/Recreation

*TEEB- The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity | United Nations Environment Program.

---

### Local Tax Revenues & Property Values

- **Trends in Personal Income per Capita**
- **Composition of Personal Income, 2014**
- **Assessed Property Value in Study Area**
- **Transactions, Severance, Use Tax Revenues Distributed to Counties and Cities**

---

### Personal Income

- **Trends in Personal Income per Capita**
- **Composition of Personal Income, 2014**

---

### Tourism & Recreation

- Tourism generates significant direct employment in all three counties, both in absolute and relative terms.

---

### Source:

- Bureau of Economic Analysis; CA4 Personal Income and Employment by Major Components.
- Arizona: Compiled from Annual Reports, Arizona Department of Revenue (pdf reports).
- California: California Board of Equalization, research and statistics page.
Population Trends

- **Population Trends in Study Area**
  - Maricopa County
  - La Paz County
  - Riverside County

- **Population Median Age in Study Area and US**
  - Maricopa County, AZ
  - Riverside County, CA
  - US

- **Population Age Distribution in Study Area**
  - La Paz County, AZ

Housing & Property Trends

- **Housing Units (single, detached, multi-unit, mobile, other)**
  - Maricopa County
  - La Paz County
  - Riverside County
  - Total

- **Median Residential Property Values in Study Area and US**
  - Maricopa County
  - La Paz County
  - Riverside County
  - US

- **Homeowner Vacancy Rates**
  - La Paz
  - Maricopa
  - Riverside

Employment Trends

- **Employment Trends in Study Area**
  - Employment in La Paz County
  - Employment in Maricopa County
  - Employment in Riverside County

- **Unemployment Rate in Study Area and in United States**

Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey.
Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis, Regional Economic accounts, CA4 Personal Income and Employment by Major Component.
Social and Economic Issues Workshop

Environmental Impact Statement
and Possible Land Use Plan Amendments
for the
Proposed Ten West Link 500kV Transmission Line Project

June 14, 2016
Quartzsite, Arizona
AGENDA

• WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS
• PURPOSE OF THE WORKSHOP
• PROJECT DESCRIPTION
• SCOPING SUMMARY AND ALTERNATIVES
• SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE DATA
• PARTICIPANT DISCUSSION SESSION
• DISCUSSION REPORT TO GROUP
• NEXT STEPS / WRAP-UP
Ground Rules

- Place cellular phones on silent or vibrate
- Side conversations are distracting
- Parking lot
- Practice active listening
- Critique ideas, not people... show respect for the views of others
- Ask questions
- Offer issues...and solutions
- Everyone’s input is valuable
JOE – Introduce John McDonald and other BLM Staff, DCRT Team and their contractors, BLM Contractors.

- AZ State Office (Ray Suazo / RECO Team)
- Yuma FO – John McDonald, Tom Jones, Vanessa Briceno
- Other BLM offices – CA SO, Palm Springs, Hassayampa FO, Lake Havasu FO, and Lower Sonoran FO resource specialists
- Cooperating Agencies – Arizona Game & Fish, Arizona State Lands, CPUC, EPA, DOD, FWS, Army Corp, La Paz County, Maricopa Association of Governments have all accepted invitations to participate. Several others have either not replied yet (Western) or have declined the invitation.
- BLM has two contractors, Stantec Environmental, EIS Contractor and Galileo Project, Assistance Contractor
- Project Proponent is DCRT LLC – (Abengoa and Starwood Energy partnership), their contractors attending today include HDR Environmental and Copper State Consulting. They have several other contractors supporting the project as well.
Workshop Objectives

- The Workshop provides an opportunity for local and regional businesses, governments, and community organizations to identify, clarify, and discuss economic and social effects that may result from the proposed Project.

- The Workshop is intended to gather and clarify social and economic information to be used later, during analyses, to determine what types of impacts may occur from the proposed Project.

- The Workshop is focused on economic and social topics related to the Ten West Link Project only.

JOE –
- introduce the purpose and objective of the meeting
- Turn over to DCRT to introduce the project
Economic Strategies Workshop

June 14, 2016
Project Description

- Ten West Link is a proposed 114-mile, 500 kilovolt (kV) series-compensated transmission project (Project) connecting the Delaney Substation near Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station to the Colorado River Substation near Blythe, California.
- Approximately 97 miles of this new interstate transmission line project will be in Arizona with approximately 17 miles traversing through California.
- The Project is being developed by DCR Transmission, LLC. (DCR Transmission), a joint venture led by Starwood Energy Group Global, Inc.
- Once completed, DCR Transmission will own and maintain this new transmission interstate transmission line and the California Independent System Operator (CAISO) will have the operational control of this facility.
- The Project will be under the regulatory jurisdiction of Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC).
Project Benefits and Goals

- **Enhance system efficiencies and improve system economics.** Project will increase high-voltage electrical transmission infrastructure capacity and capability, increase efficiency of transmission network, increase competition among suppliers.

- **Enhance operational flexibility.** Stronger transmission network will allow some flexibility to redirect power flows under normal and emergency conditions, improve system reliability, defer upgrades.

- **Enhance access to diverse resources.** Project will expand regional access to low-cost, environmentally friendly, more cost-effective generation sources.

- **Facilitate development of new renewable energy.** Project will create new transmission infrastructure needed to interconnect future renewable energy resources in Arizona and California.

- **Improve regional collaboration.** Project will facilitate efficient and increased sharing of generation resources between two states, enable effective integration of resources.
Project Benefits and Goals (cont’d)

• **Strengthen regional reliability.** Project will strengthen regional transmission system, add additional capacity, alleviate grid congestion, improve energy reliability for consumers.

• **Promote regional economic development.** Project will provide regional economic benefits or impacts in terms of jobs, earnings, business revenue, value added, tax revenues. Large impacts are generated during construction, smaller but permanent impacts are generated when projects begin operations.
  • Direct impacts arising as immediate consequences of construction activities (e.g. employment of construction workers) and subsequently operations (e.g. employment of operations and maintenance staff).
  • Indirect impacts stemming from project-related expenditures on input supplies and services during construction and then operations (e.g. expenditures on concrete, steel, supplies).
  • Induced impacts stemming from re-spending of wages and salaries by those employed by Project directly or related to it indirectly (e.g. workers at suppliers of concrete, steel, etc. re-spending their incomes on food, housing, etc.).

• **Conserve resources.** Project will use already developed transmission or utility corridors whenever possible, minimizing visual, environmental, cultural and other impacts.
JOE –

• Explain where we are in the NEPA process

• Acknowledge we were in Quartzsite and Blythe in April, thank folks that participated in the meetings and provided comments
General Comments
Public scoping respondents commonly expressed a preference for:
• siting within the existing Devers to Palo Verde line right-of-way to minimize “new” impacts
• siting within the West-wide Energy Corridor because it has already been analyzed and deemed to be environmentally acceptable

Public scoping respondents commonly expressed concern about or opposition to:
• alternative routes that would go through Johnson Canyon due to the recreational resources (primarily OHV)
• siting on the Kofa NWR due to incompatibility with the mission of the NWR and potential wildlife impacts, including to special status species
• siting on the Yuma Proving Grounds due to incompatibility with mission operations and security

Joe – What we heard when we were here before
Social and Economic Comments From Scoping

Public scoping respondents expressed concern that:
• the Project would negatively affect property values
• the Project would affect economic opportunities related to recreation and tourism
• a reduction in tax base caused by granting a right-of-way to the Project would cause negative fiscal and social impacts to counties and undermine the counties’ ability to sustain themselves through tax revenues in the long-term
• there would be a decreased quality of life for county residents due to reductions in social services such as schools, fire, sheriff, and roads/public works

Potential benefits noted by public scoping respondents included:
• construction of the Project would create jobs
• an influx of workers during the construction of the Project would benefit secondary businesses like restaurants, stores, motels, etc.
Joe –

- explain that these segments were identified through internal and external scoping activities. Feedback from Cooperating Agencies, BLM offices/resource specialists, stakeholders, and local special interest groups.
- Not all of these segments will be carried forward for full analysis in the EIS, but serve as a starting point for the BLM.
- Reminder that the objective of THIS meeting is identify, clarify, and discuss economic and social impacts that may result from the proposed Project, not an alternative workshop. This is an information gathering meeting.

- Introduce Michael Johnson, Regional Socioeconomic Specialist for Arizona and New Mexico to provide more detail on social and economic impacts and what we hope to accomplish today.
What Are Economic and Social Effects?

Economic effects are potential changes to the economy of a specific area over a specified amount of time.

Economic effects of an action can be thought of in a variety of ways:

- **Regional economic effects** are the effects of an action on things like economic output, employment, and wages.
- **Fiscal impacts** are the effects of an action on government revenues and expenditures.
- **Non-market impacts** are the effects of an action which may not have a direct monetary impact but cause changes in things like important landscapes and views (such as the perception of “wildness” by hikers and campers), and ecosystem services (such as providing open space for all users and natural sources of water).
Michael

- Introduce DCRT economist to present the data gathered to date.
- Remind group that following the break we will have a group / breakout group discussion.
- Any questions so far?

**Social effects** are changes to the values and beliefs of people in a specified area, usually brought about by a specific action.

- **Values** are relatively general, basic, and enduring, conceptions of what is good or bad, right or wrong, desirable or undesirable. An example of a value might be that acting or behaving in certain ways while in nature is correct and respectful.

- **Beliefs** are personal judgments about what is true or false about a given object, place, or situation. Beliefs may change over a relatively short time. An example of a belief might be an assumption that your own perception of the qualities of a landscape are held by everyone else.
Contents

- Methodology
- Key observations from data analysis
- Study area population and trends
- Housing and property values
- Employment and unemployment
- Income
- Local tax revenues
- Tourism and recreation and its economic impact
- Non-market socio-economic values that may be affected
- Ecosystem services
Socio-economic Methodology

- Baseline analysis examining existing characteristics and trends over the past 15 years
- Study area defined by the three counties where project is expected to be located:
  - La Paz County, Arizona
  - Maricopa County, Arizona, and
  - Riverside County, California
- Analysis primarily at county level due to data limitations
- Study area compared to benchmark of the United States as a whole
- Topic areas include:
  - Population
  - Housing
  - Employment
  - Taxes
  - Property value
  - Economic impact of recreation industry
  - Overview of ecosystems and non-market values
Peak population 20,647 in 2007; declined slightly to 20,231 in 2014
Median age of 54.6 in 2014
   Higher than median age in rest of study area
   Median age up 16.7% from 46.8 in 2000
Share of seniors in population growing rapidly

La Paz County – Key Observations

• Declining population
• Rapidly aging population: median age much higher than in other study area counties and US-average, rapidly growing share of seniors in total population
• Primary economic drivers
  • Agriculture
  • Travel and Tourism
• Economically very challenged: total employment still recovering to pre-crisis level, unemployment rate above US average
• Personal incomes much lower than in other study area counties and US average and with much higher share of transfers in total income (as opposed to earnings)
Maricopa County – Key Observations

- Relatively high population growth compared to US average, although slower in recent years
- Younger population compared to US average: lower median age, higher share of younger population groups (children, youth, and young adults)
- Economically challenged: total employment just recovered to pre-crisis levels, unemployment rate below US-average but above pre-crisis level
- Relatively high share of employment in professional, management, and administrative services industries, lower employment in government
- Personal incomes lower than US average, the gap to US average growing in recent years
- Fiscally challenged local governments: tax revenues below pre-crisis peak (in nominal dollars terms), decreased property values
Study Area – Riverside County
Riverside County – Key Observations

- High population growth in the early to mid-2000s compared to US average, growth slowed down substantially in recent years
- Younger population compared to US average: lower median age, higher share of younger population groups (children, youth, and young adults)
- Economically challenged: employment just recovered to pre-crisis levels but unemployment rate remains relatively high and above US average
- Personal incomes lower than US average
- Fiscally challenged local governments: tax revenues just recovering to pre-crisis level (in nominal dollars terms), decreased property values
Study Area Population - 2014

- 6.2 million residents in study area
- Population split:
  - Maricopa County – 63.3%
  - Riverside County – 36.4%
  - La Paz County – 0.3%

Source: Economic Profile System, data based on American Community Survey 5-year estimates.
• Total population in study area increased by more than 1/3 over 2000-2014, from 4.6 million to 6.2 million. This compares with population growth of less than 12% across all of US.
• Population growth was slowing down over time, both across all of US as well as in study area.
• Riverside County had fastest growth: more than 45% over 2000-2014, from 1.5 million to 2.3 million.
• La Paz County population experienced very modest growth of 3.2% over 2000 - 2014, less than half of all of US growth, and declined over 2010-2014.
• Largest population group in study area in 2000 and 2014: younger working age adults age 25 to 44
• Over 2000-2014, largest increase was in population group of older working age adults age 45 to 64
• Seniors 65 years and older represent smallest population group, however, this group is growing at a fast rate
• Population median age is increasing across all levels of geographies. In La Paz County, median age is much higher than elsewhere (54.6 years in 2014) and increasing at a faster rate than elsewhere.
• Except for Riverside County, the share of seniors in total population was increasing over 2000 - 2014. In Riverside County, this share declined.
• At the same time, share of children, youth and young adults declined over 2000 to 2014 in all jurisdictions.
• Share of older working age adults (45 to 64 years) increased in all jurisdictions, except for La Paz County.
Over 2007-2014, number of housing units in study area increased by about 11%. La Paz County had much smaller increase of about 3.4%
Number of households increased in all counties in study area by 8% or more, including La Paz County
Except for La Paz County, increase in number of households was smaller than increase in housing units
• Over 2007-2014, homeowner vacancy rates in study area were larger than in all of US. In Maricopa County, rental vacancy rates were also higher than in all of US.
• In 2010, homeowner and rental vacancy rates increased in study area compared to 2007. By 2014, vacancy rates declined, except for La Paz County.
• In Riverside County and across all of US, homeowner vacancy rates declined to a level below that observed in 2007; in Maricopa County they remained above the 2007 level.
• In 2014, homeowner and rental vacancy rates in study area exceeded US-wide vacancy rates.
• Riverside County has the highest property values in study area followed by Maricopa County. These values exceed overall US property values.
• In all geographies, property values declined over 2007-2014; 2014 values (5-year estimates) were lower compared to 2007 (3-year estimates). In Riverside County, values declined by 40%.
• Property values increased in recent 2 years as evidenced by 2014 1-year estimates (not shown here). However, they still did not fully recover to 2007 level.
Total employment in study area increased from about 2.6 million in 2001 to 3.3 million in 2014. This represents an increase of nearly 720,000 jobs, or 28%.

In all counties, employment peaked in 2007 and declined over 2008 to 2010. Employment started growing again in 2011. In Maricopa and Riverside Counties, 2014 employment exceeded 2007 pre-recession peak. However, in La Paz County it remained below pre-recession peak.
Over 2000-2015, Maricopa County had lowest unemployment rate below US-wide rate. Unemployment rate in La Paz County and Riverside County exceeded US-average rate. Trends in unemployment rate in study area were broadly consistent with US-wide trends. During economic recession unemployment rate in Riverside County increased to nearly 14% compared to a peak of less than 10% US average. This unemployment rate declined to 6.7% in 2015 but remains above US-average level. In 2015, highest unemployment rate was in La Paz County at 7.6% compared to 5.2% in Maricopa County, 6.7% in Riverside County, and 5.3% on average across all of US. This rate is also above the pre-recession levels.
• Industrial structure of employment in study area is broadly consistent with structure and trends observed across all of US.
• Except for Maricopa County, largest share of employment is in government (federal, state, and local). In 2014, share of government services amounted to 30% in La Paz County, 9.5% in Maricopa County, and 13.4% in Riverside County compared to 12.9% US average.
• Second largest employment is in retail trade at over 10% of total. Combined with wholesale trade, the sector accounts for about 14% of total employment. Between 2001 and 2014, the share of this sector declined slightly.
• Between 2001 and 2014, share of health care services and education services increased in Maricopa County, Riverside County, and US-wide to more than 10%.
• Share of manufacturing industry in study area is smaller than US average (about 5% vs. 7.5%). Between 2001 and 2014, this share decreased across all levels of geographies.
• Share of construction industry in study area was larger than US average. However, this share declined between 2001 and 2014.
• Share of farm employment amounted to 4% in La Paz County but less than 1% in other counties. This compares to a share of 1.4% across all of US.
Over 2001-2014, personal income per capita in study area was in general lower than on average across US (except for a short pre-recession period in Maricopa County).

La Paz County had lowest per capita income. In 2014, this income amounted to $29,219, and was followed by Riverside County at $33,590, and Maricopa County at $41,222. US average amounted to $46,049.

Personal income growth was fastest in La Paz County at 3.9% compared to 2.4% in Maricopa County, 2.1% in Riverside County, and 3% across US.
In 2014, in all jurisdictions earnings had largest share of income. Share of earnings varied from less than 45% in La Paz County to nearly 2/3 in Maricopa County and 64% in Riverside County and across US.

- Dividends, Interest, and Rent accounted for about 16% to 19% of personal income.
- Transfers had the largest share in La Paz County at more than 36% of 2014 personal income. This was followed by Riverside County with a share of nearly 20%.
- Compared to 2001, share of transfers increased across all geographies, while share of earnings decreased.
Over 2001-2014, average compensation per job in study area was lower than US average. In 2014, in Maricopa County the compensation gap with all of US amounted to about $5,000 while this gap amounted to about $12,500 in Riverside County and $16,800 in La Paz County.

For Maricopa County and Riverside County, the difference with US average compensation per job tended to widen over time (both in relative and absolute terms).
Across all jurisdictions, the best paying jobs are in utilities, management, and federal government. Average 2014 salaries in these industries were as follows:

- **Utilities:** $144,172 in Maricopa County, $108,751 in Riverside County, and $127,771 U.S. average
- **Management:** $100,148 in Maricopa County, $80,567 in Riverside County, and $123,615 U.S. average
- **Federal government:** $87,816 in La Paz County, $99,920 in Maricopa County, $110,692 in Riverside County, and $109,172 U.S. wide

The higher-paying jobs in these counties compare to average compensations of $43,315 in La Paz County, $61,297 in Maricopa County, $53,717 in

### Average Compensation, by Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Maricopa County</th>
<th>La Paz County</th>
<th>Riverside County</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm employment</td>
<td>$33,081</td>
<td>$39,038</td>
<td>$22,565</td>
<td>$11,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfarm employment</td>
<td>$47,886</td>
<td>$32,549</td>
<td>$38,520</td>
<td>$50,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private nonfarm employment</td>
<td>$45,563</td>
<td>$22,953</td>
<td>$31,580</td>
<td>$46,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry, fishing, and related activities</td>
<td>$18,166</td>
<td>$29,507</td>
<td>$28,932</td>
<td>$23,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, quarrying, and oil and gas extraction</td>
<td>$131,375</td>
<td>$5,623</td>
<td>$11,477</td>
<td>$56,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$144,172</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$108,751</td>
<td>$127,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$47,306</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$42,767</td>
<td>$43,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>$52,625</td>
<td>$38,338</td>
<td>$58,928</td>
<td>$74,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td>$79,428</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$57,647</td>
<td>$76,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>$32,715</td>
<td>$23,807</td>
<td>$28,874</td>
<td>$29,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and warehousing</td>
<td>$48,714</td>
<td>$28,286</td>
<td>$35,807</td>
<td>$47,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and insurance</td>
<td>$96,650</td>
<td>$21,029</td>
<td>$29,083</td>
<td>$69,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate and rental and leasing</td>
<td>$14,068</td>
<td>$6,061</td>
<td>$7,564</td>
<td>$15,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific, and technical services</td>
<td>$56,248</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$24,944</td>
<td>$66,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of companies and enterprises</td>
<td>$100,148</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$80,567</td>
<td>$123,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and support and waste management services</td>
<td>$36,008</td>
<td>$11,833</td>
<td>$20,923</td>
<td>$32,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational services</td>
<td>$41,961</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$24,402</td>
<td>$38,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care and social assistance</td>
<td>$55,191</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$42,151</td>
<td>$49,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment, and recreation</td>
<td>$28,645</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$19,479</td>
<td>$22,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and food services</td>
<td>$24,848</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$23,542</td>
<td>$25,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services (except public administration)</td>
<td>$24,146</td>
<td>$17,617</td>
<td>$20,228</td>
<td>$26,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and government enterprises</td>
<td>$69,661</td>
<td>$53,328</td>
<td>$82,913</td>
<td>$73,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal, civilian</td>
<td>$99,920</td>
<td>$87,816</td>
<td>$110,692</td>
<td>$109,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>$48,152</td>
<td>$26,932</td>
<td>$33,874</td>
<td>$67,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and local</td>
<td>$97,999</td>
<td>$48,597</td>
<td>$82,850</td>
<td>$69,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State government</td>
<td>$66,966</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$82,873</td>
<td>$72,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>$58,959</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$62,848</td>
<td>$68,359</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Calculated based on Bureau of Economic Analysis employment and compensation by industry data.
Riverside County, and $63,726 U.S. average (consult chart Average Compensation per Job)
• Industries with relatively lower average salaries include: real estate, arts and entertainment, other services, and retail trade. Average salaries in these industries are below $30,000.
• For La Paz County, there are several data gaps. However, based on data that is available, it is notable that farm employment provides the highest salary for non-government jobs. This salary is also higher than farm salaries in Maricopa County, Riverside County, or on average across all of US.
Local Government Tax Revenues – Sales Related

- Sales tax revenues distributed to counties and cities were falling between 2008 and 2010.
- In 2011, sales tax revenues distributed to counties and cities started to increase again. However, in Maricopa County, they have not fully recovered to pre-crisis level.

Source: Arizona: Compiled from Annual Reports, Arizona Department of Revenue (jiff reports). California: California Board of Equalization, research and statistics page.
• Over 2006-2015, property tax revenues in La Paz County were increasing or remaining stable.
• In Maricopa County and Riverside County, property tax revenues were increasing until 2009 and then started falling. In the last 2 years, revenues increased somewhat but have not fully recovered to 2009 levels.
• Property valuation were increasing in the study area until 2009/2010 and then started to fall.
• In Maricopa County and Riverside County, property values rebounded in the last 2 years but have not fully recovered to the pre-crisis level.
Tourism and Recreation – Resources

- All three counties boast a range of significant tourism and recreation resources, and visitor attractions
  - Desert scenery
  - Colorado River/Parker Strip, lakes, with water recreation and sports opportunities
  - State Parks (River Island, Buckskin Mountain, Alamo Lake, Anza-Borrego Desert, Chino-Hills, Lake Perris)
  - Parks (municipal), hiking/bike trails with desert/mountain/water views
  - Golf courses
  - Festivals/fairs, entertainment, shopping
  - Ghost towns, history dating back to mid-19th century

- Quartzsite (La Paz County) welcomes over 1 million RV visitors during the winter months, including visitors and exhibitors for rocks, gems, mineral specimens and fossils during the town’s two-month-long gem show and swap meet every January and February.
Tourism and Recreation – Economic Impact

Tourism-Related Visitor Spending and Tax Revenues, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Maricopa County</th>
<th>La Paz County</th>
<th>Riverside County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Spending, $Millions</td>
<td>$9,500.0</td>
<td>$137.4</td>
<td>$6,800.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Spending per County</td>
<td>$2,324</td>
<td>$6,792</td>
<td>$2,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident, $</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tax Revenue, $Millions</td>
<td>$946.1</td>
<td>$10.3</td>
<td>$557.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Revenue as % of Total</td>
<td>125.4%</td>
<td>360.9%</td>
<td>243.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transaction Privilege Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on Arizona Office of Tourism, Interactive County Travel Impacts Reports and Visit California, Interactive County Travel Impact Reports

- All three counties attract a significant number of visitors who spend money, and generate tax revenues, jobs (see next slide), etc.
- In La Paz County, visitor spending per county resident amounts to over $6,700 annually. In Maricopa County and Riverside County, visitor spending is lower but still exceeds $2,300 per resident annually.
- Direct tax receipts related to tourism are well in excess of sales tax revenues distributed by state governments to each county and its cities.

Sales Tax includes (transaction privilege and severance tax)
### Tourism and Recreation – Economic Impact (cont’d)

#### Direct Employment in Tourism-Related Industries, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Maricopa County</th>
<th>La Paz County</th>
<th>Riverside County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation &amp; Food Services</td>
<td>44,800</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>43,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>18,900</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>18,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>13,900</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>6,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Travel</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Transportation</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Air Transportation</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tourism</td>
<td>94,200</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>72,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Average Direct Earnings, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Maricopa County</th>
<th>La Paz County</th>
<th>Riverside County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation &amp; Food Services</td>
<td>$31,250</td>
<td>$27,183</td>
<td>$25,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>$31,746</td>
<td>$29,563</td>
<td>$26,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>$71,942</td>
<td>$24,855</td>
<td>$29,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Travel</td>
<td>$82,192</td>
<td>$16,667</td>
<td>$55,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Transportation</td>
<td>$32,258</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$66,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Air Transportation</td>
<td>$32,258</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$66,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tourism</td>
<td>$42,418</td>
<td>$23,827</td>
<td>$27,435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on Arizona Office of Tourism, Interactive County Travel Impact Reports and Visit California, Interactive County Travel Impact Reports

- Tourism generates significant direct employment in all three counties. In La Paz County employment in tourism related industries accounts for over 17% of total employment.
- Average earnings in tourism-related industries tend to be lower than all-industry average.
Studies on socio-economic implications and impacts of transmission lines suggest a range of potential impacts on surrounding areas that may be difficult to evaluate in monetary terms.

- **Visual disturbance.** Transmission lines may negatively affect perceptions of landscapes and their attractiveness as natural or recreational resources, limit location of buildings, or tourist trails. In residential areas, transmission lines may reduce property values within a certain distance.
  - Assessments of property value impacts vary significantly from no impact to about 8% (and possibly higher) of average selling price of affected properties.

- **Interference with agricultural operations.** Transmission towers may impede agricultural operations and contribute to weed propagation from under towers. This may increase labor costs as well as reduce value of agricultural lands.
  - Labor cost impacts assessed at $27 per steel tower and yield loss at $207 per tower.
  - Loss in agricultural land values assessed at about 1% to 2.4%.

- **Soil damage.** Transmission line construction activities may impact soil structure around tower bases.

- **Impact on natural environment and wild life.** Construction and maintenance of transmission lines may impact plant species and wildlife or disrupt their habitat.

- The impacts listed may be relevant to this project and study area and may affect local economies (e.g. tourist perceptions of sceneries with transmission towers, impact of towers on agriculture).

### Non-Market Values Potentially Impacted by Project

- Studies on socio-economic implications and impacts of transmission lines suggest a range of potential impacts on surrounding areas that may be difficult to evaluate in monetary terms.
  - **Visual disturbance.** Transmission lines may negatively affect perceptions of landscapes and their attractiveness as natural or recreational resources, limit location of buildings, or tourist trails. In residential areas, transmission lines may reduce property values within a certain distance.
    - Assessments of property value impacts vary significantly from no impact to about 8% (and possibly higher) of average selling price of affected properties.
  - **Interference with agricultural operations.** Transmission towers may impede agricultural operations and contribute to weed propagation from under towers. This may increase labor costs as well as reduce value of agricultural lands.
    - Labor cost impacts assessed at $27 per steel tower and yield loss at $207 per tower.
    - Loss in agricultural land values assessed at about 1% to 2.4%.
  - **Soil damage.** Transmission line construction activities may impact soil structure around tower bases.
  - **Impact on natural environment and wild life.** Construction and maintenance of transmission lines may impact plant species and wildlife or disrupt their habitat.

- The impacts listed may be relevant to this project and study area and may affect local economies (e.g. tourist perceptions of sceneries with transmission towers, impact of towers on agriculture).
may increase labor costs as well as reduce value of agricultural lands.

- Labor cost impacts assessed at $27 per steel tower and yield loss at $207 per tower.
- Loss in agricultural land values assessed at about 1% to 2.4%.

- **Soil damage.** Transmission line construction activities may impact soil structure around tower bases.
- **Impact on natural environment and wildlife.** Construction and maintenance of transmission lines may impact plant species and wildlife or disrupt their habitat.

The impacts listed may be relevant to this project and study area and may affect local economies (e.g. tourist perceptions of sceneries with transmission towers, impact of towers on agriculture).
Ecosystem Services in Study Area

- Ecosystem Services in Study Area; based on The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) classification
  - Provisioning services:
    - Food supply (e.g. all three counties boast significant agricultural production with a wide range of products: vegetables, citrus and other fruits, field crops, cattle and poultry, milk, eggs)
    - Water supply (e.g. Colorado River, Gila River, lakes, used for recreation and irrigation)
  - Regulating services
    - Water regulation (e.g. Colorado River, Gila River, Salt River, artificial reservoirs build to improve flood control)
  - Habitat services
    - Habitat and biodiversity (e.g. preservation of rare and endangered species of plants and animals in all three counties)
  - Cultural and amenity services
    - Aesthetic services (e.g. enjoyment of desert and mountain scenery)
    - Recreation and tourism (e.g. all three counties feature wide range of tourism and recreation resources outlined on earlier slide)
    - Cultural and artistic (e.g. The multiple cultural groups in study area perceive and interpret the landscape, natural and cultural resources of the area in many different ways and thus may receive differing services from the landscape)
Sources

- Bureau of Economic Analysis (total employment, employment by industry, compensation, income by source)  
  http://www.bea.gov/iTable/iTable.cfm?reqid=70&step=1&isuri=1&acrdn=7 #reqid=70&step=1&isuri=1
- US Census (population, age distribution, housing units, housing vacancy rates, property values)  
  http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml
- Bureau of Labor Statistics (unemployment)  
  http://www.bls.gov/lau/
- Arizona Department of Revenue, Annual Reports (tax revenue, tax revenue distributed to cities and counties)  
  https://www.azdor.gov/ReportsResearch/AnnualReports.aspx
- California Board of Equalization (tax revenues)  
  http://www.boe.ca.gov/legdiv/legresearch.htm
- Arizona Office of Tourism (economic impact of tourism – visitor spending, direct jobs, direct tax revenues)  
  https://tourism.az.gov/research-statistics/economic-impact
- Visit California (economic impact of tourism – visitor spending, direct jobs, direct tax revenues)  
  http://industry.visitcalifornia.com/find-research/california-statistics-trends/
Sources (cont’d)

- Socio-economic impact literature and reviews (non-market values potentially impacted by project)
- Various web-based resources, government agencies (ecosystem services)
PARTICIPANT DISCUSSION SESSION
Breakout Groups

• Identify social issues and values for area communities
• Identify social and economic opportunities and constraints
• Identify possible collaboration opportunities
Discussion

- What are some important social, environmental, and economic issues, values, and concerns that are usually considered by your community?
- Are there specific route alternatives or BLM management actions associated with the proposed project that may result in significantly different social and economic effects on your community?
- What are some partnership/collaboration opportunities that may result from this project between BLM and your community/industry/organization?
- Are there any key geographic areas and/or industries that should be examined in detail for social/economic discussion?
- Are there key data sources that should be included in any social and economic analyses?

Grace – Explaining breakouts
Social and Economic Comments From Scoping

Public scoping respondents expressed concern that:
- the Project would negatively affect property values
- the Project would affect economic opportunities related to recreation and tourism
- a reduction in tax base caused by granting a right-of-way to the Project would cause negative fiscal and social impacts to counties and undermine the counties’ ability to sustain themselves through tax revenues in the long-term
- there would be a decreased quality of life for county residents due to reductions in social services such as schools, fire, sheriff, and roads/public works

Potential benefits noted by public scoping respondents included:
- construction of the Project would create jobs
- an influx of workers during the construction of the Project would benefit secondary businesses like restaurants, stores, motels, etc.

KEEP UP DURING BREAKOUTS
GROUP REPORTS & DISCUSSION
Next Steps / Wrap-Up

- Comment due June 28, 2016 - Submit your written comments
- Email comments to blm_az_azso_10WestLink@blm.gov
- Mail comments to -
  Ten West Link Project
  Attn: Joe Incardine
  BLM Arizona State Office
  One North Central Avenue, Ste. 800
  Phoenix, AZ 85004; or
- Fax comments to Ten West Link Project, Attn: Joe Incardine, (602) 417-9452

For more information visit the BLM website:
www.blm.gov/az/st/en/prog/energy/10_west_link_transmission.html

JOE –
- Wrap up and thank you for coming
- Reminder to submit written comments – this is NOT a formal scoping comment period, but the BLM wants to hear from you with comments that are specific to the social and economic impacts or benefits you see stemming from the proposed project.
- This is not your final opportunity to be involved – following the publication of the DEIS, expected in early spring 2017, there will be a 90-day public comment period.
APPENDIX 3
NOTES ON WORKSHOP; NOTES ON GROUP DISCUSSIONS; AND WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED
Economic Strategies Workshop Notes

Ten West Link Project

Date: June 14, 2016 12:30pm (Pacific/Arizona)

Location: Quartzsite Senior Center, Quartzsite, Arizona

I. See Presentation for additional information.

II. Question & Answer

A. What changes will be made with the Resource Management Plan Amendment (RMPA)? There will be a change to the visual resource management (VRM) classification and a corridor change.

B. Is this a private project? The transmission line will be owned by DCRT, which is a private entity. DCRT is governed by FERC regulations for cost, etc. The CAISO will control the line capacity.

C. Will DCRT be paying property tax in Arizona? Yes. DCRT will be paying tax on private property and lease fees for BLM land.

D. Will the lease fee to BLM increase La Paz County’s PILT? The PILT calculation is authorized by Congress annually and is based on a specific formula. The BLM / DOI do not have direct control over that amount. PILT (payment in lieu of taxes) is a way to compensate counties with public land for the loss or property taxes they would otherwise receive.

E. Who would own the transmission line and towers? DCRT will own the project. The BLM would be leasing ROW to the company for the project.

F. What is the compensation – specifically taxes – for each county? DCRT is working on that calculation now.

G. How are vacancies counted for areas such as Quartzsite where there are a lot of out-of-state owners? Additional research is needed to answer this question. It was noted that Quartzsite has quite a few out-of-state property owners who pay taxes but aren’t counted as part of the census.

H. La Paz County noted that a greater portion of the proposed line (approximately 80%) will be in La Paz County. Applying any economic data from Maricopa and Riverside counties to this project for a regional overview of the study area is unfair, since La Paz has the majority of the project. The economic study areas should be specific to La Paz or other counties and not on a regional (i.e., grouped) basis.

III. Group Presentations (each group was asked to discuss potential social and economic impacts to the project area)
A. Green (Brandon Colvin): There would be impacts to tourism and recreation for those who come to the area for its unique assets. There would be impacts to realty values and human health for those who may live in the vicinity of the line, which also ties into a loss of revenue for La Paz County. The loss of biological habitat would impact locals and visitors to the area. Due to local environmental justice concerns in La Paz County, impacts would be greater. There is a smaller private base and a smaller community, which would amplify impacts. The smaller tax base also has a downward multiplier on all services. The benefits to the public would be outside of the local region.

B. Orange (Eddie Arreola): Jobs should be kept to the local community to the extent possible. The analysis should consider the “boom/bust” scenario and what the impacts would be from an influx of workers who then leave. DCRT should look at the possibility of partnerships with local colleges for training opportunities as this would foster skill sets that would create a future benefit to the local population. There should be a focus on the positive aspects of the project including adding redundancy to an aging grid, etc. The CR8 and CR9 segments would create line-of-sight issues for Yuma Proving Ground and could lead to potential job loss. The analysis should look at economic differences for a build out along I-10 vs. no build out in the area. This should look at a longer term as well (50+ years). La Paz/Quartzsite economic trends/drivers include recreation, long-term visitors, and ag production. Any permanent closures of recreational areas would have a negative impact on the recreational economy.

C. Yellow (Nancy Favour): La Paz County reiterated their concern that the economic data presented was on too broad of a scale. There is also a question about the accuracy of the data and the data sources were requested. There is concern that La Paz County would not see very many benefits from this project as the benefits are focused elsewhere. There is concern about recreation areas, particularly the Arizona Peace Trail, which is a big attraction. Access to these areas should not be limited or closed. Concerns about impacts to the mining community were also expressed. Construction should not occur during the winter months in order to avoid impacts to winter visitors. It would be great if the BLM and proponent would say that there would be no net loss of recreational trails available for OHV users and ensure that the public gets that message. There is a perception that this project would lead to closure of recreational opportunities, which would curtail the local economy. Johnson Canyon should not be closed. Proactive, positive messaging would be helpful. It would also be useful to have a greater understanding of how this project could lead to future economic growth for the area.

D. Red (Schelle Davis): The analysis should consider economic impacts to hunting and fishing in the area. There should also be consideration of impacts to quality of life choices for locals and visitors. There would be potential impact to access to open space, which is a double-edged sword – too much access could damage the landscape or open up more room for recreation. Property values for land close to the line would be negatively impacted. There may also be indirect impacts to the economy if the transmission line increases attraction of solar facilities near Yuma Proving Ground – the YPG mission could be impacted by glare, etc. YPG brings economic positives to
the community, so impacting that area could be negative. The line does have potential to open up new renewable opportunities. Local residents do have an emotional attachment to the area (e.g., views, etc.) so there is some natural resistance to change. The line may also bring in/attract ancillary businesses. There are agricultural considerations for farmers, particularly with crop dusting, etc., although the general consensus is that this would not be a significant impact. The project is a driver for the community to develop positive collaboration opportunities, which is beneficial for the area.

E. Blue (Lane Cowger): Impacts to Johnson Canyon would have impacts to OHV tourism. There is concern about economic loss related to OHV tourism. Yuma and Mohave counties may also be impacted, but most of the impact would be for La Paz County. There are potential cascading impacts for the tourism industry – hotels, restaurants, etc. Any adverse impacts to the pristine nature of Johnson Canyon, any closures, etc. would be negative. There would be impacts to existing businesses but there may also be impacts to future development. Tourism in this part of the County has experienced a generational shift. There are younger visitors with a more active go-and-do mentality. There were concerns about the line’s proximity to Quartzsite, particularly south of the city limits as this would have impacts to visual resources and potential health issues. The potential positive impact would be the possible access to additional solar facilities. The lack of available work force to be part of the construction of this or subsequent projects is also a concern.

IV. Other Discussion Items
A. Comment deadline is June 28, 2016.

V. Action Items/Follow-up Questions
A. Do towers and wires fall under possessory interest? If so, is that taxable?
B. What would be the annual payment to La Paz County in relation to the ROW? Does it change the PILT?
C. What is the estimated property tax (by proponent) to be paid to the counties?
D. Do we need to explore greater granularity in the social and economic data in all counties?
E. How are the vacancy rates calculated for the presented economic data?
F. The analysis should address the impacts of out-of-state landowners.
G. Economic data sources should be provided.
Ten West Link Project: Economic Strategies Workshop

Flip Chart Transcription

June 14, 2016

Action Items (6/14/16)

- Do towers and wire fall under possessory interest? If so isn’t that taxable?
- What would be the/any annual payment to the county in relation to the row? Does it change PILT?
- What is the estimated property tax (by proponent) to be paid to county?
- Do we need to explore greater granularity in soc-econ data in Riverside and Maricopa Cos?
- Need to address impacts of out of state owners.
- How are vacancy rates calculated?

Green Group (Brandon Colvin) - G

1. Tourism/visitors (social and economic)
2. Unique environment (asset)
3. Maintaining/finding balance (approving development) between access/preservation
4. Concerned over loss of tourism visitation and money due to degradation of the environment.
5. Potential inability for local entities to participate in energy development because of CAISO (ultimate decision maker)
6. Property impacts because of loss of scenic quality. (Real estate values and loss of real estate tax revenue)
7. Potential impact to human health
8. Plus loss of County Revenues
9. Loss of wildlife and habitat/FRAG. Impacting visitors/hunters/other users (local and other)
   E.J.
10. Due to local environment justice conditions, impacts to this area are greater.
11. Benefits to the public are outside of the local region where direct/indirect impacts are occurring.
12. Market not working to quantify those impacts.

Orange group (Eddie Arreola and Meredith Griffin) - O

2. Discussion of project positives- including reinforcement of aging grid infrastructure. Black/brown-outs. (Statistics/etc.)
3. [CB8 and CB9] Would be direct line of site -> security issue possible job loss. [Encroachment into YPG with potential jobs loss.]
4. Economic differences for I-10 build-out area with and without transmission line. Look at 50-70 year build-out vs shorter term.
5. Recreational impacts from any areas closed would have an economic impact to local economy.

Yellow group (Nancy Favour) - Y
1. More granular data - broken down further to specific region in project area.
2. Verification of accuracy of the presented data question- what is the best source data?
3. Clarify the benefits to La Paz County from the project.
4. Impacts to recreational riders and recreational trails. (Peace Trail and other existing trails and riding areas.)
5. Concern about impact to existing off-trails (designated trails) and mining.
6. Impacts to recreational use during construction period. (Can quartzite construction occur during summer, MAY-SEPTEMBER)
7. There should be a net gain to the recreational trails in the region.
8. Perception that project will result in recreational trails closures. Plomosa Rd. (Mentioned specifically)
10. Proactive promotion of no negative impacts of line and positive benefits if the project to recreational use.
11. Identify how project would promote development of renewable projects in La Paz County.

Red group (Schelle Davis and Ellen Carr) - R
1. Consider economic impact of hunting and fishing
2. Quality of life choices- (ATV, hunt, fish, camp)
3. Integration and access to open space
   - Too much- damage or positive economic impacts more visitors.
   - Too little (reduce) - not enough space for visitors
4. Property values if too close to residents/community facilities
5. Indirect impacts if line attracts increases solar near YPG, could impact (mission) uses - cumulative.
6. Has the potential to open up connections to new renewable energy projects.
7. Emotional attachment to views, lifestyle, and resistance to change.
8. Would power line bring in or attract any other business that would need access to power- other than solar or power generation- (industrial park)
9. Agricultural- additional consideration for farmers (crop dusting)
10. Be a driver for the community (YPG, residents, seasonal users, AGFD…) to develop beneficial collaborative projects and communication.
Blue group (Lane Cowger) - B

1. Johnson Canyon Segment
   - Possible loss of economic benefit from tourism/OHV to La Paz and Quartzsite
   - Yuma and Mohave Co too
   - Cascading impacts on hotel, merchant, etc.
   - Loss of pristine condition in Johnson
   - Impacts to current business, possible chilling effect on future economic development

2. Generational shift of Quartzsite tourism
   - More OHV
   - Possibly younger tourists- may or may not be snowbirds
   - “GO and DO” tourism

3. Quartzsite as a “base camp” for Peace Trail
   - Other institutes- local park board staging area

4. Concern about proximity to Quartzsite of I-10 parallel route
   - Impacts to views, visual resources
   - Health impacts of x-lines

5. Potential positive impacts of grid access to solar and other renewables
   - Understanding of current transmission bottleneck

6. Concern about lack of available local workforce for construction and technical jobs
   - Counter- residuals staying
   - Potential for positive impacts during construction
Mr. Joseph Incardine  
BLM Arizona State Office  
Renewable Energy Coordination Office  
Ten West Link Transmission Project  
One North Central Ave. Suite 800  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004  

Dear Mr. Incardine:

The La Paz County Board of Supervisors believes that the Ten West Link, (regardless of route selected) will have major negative socio-economic impacts to our taxpaying citizens, incorporated and unincorporated communities and our County as a whole.

Clearly, these major transmission lines, once constructed, will last for many generations to come. Future trans-county infrastructure projects are likely to follow the same path broadening the scope of negative impacts. The nature of these impacts will include potential threats to health and safety, effects on community infrastructure, social conflict, changes to local government from economic and social dislocation, and alterations in community social structures caused by the long-term nature of the Ten West Link. All of these negative impacts need to be quantified and addressed for mitigation fees as part of the socio-economic study.

At the national policy level, the socioeconomic vulnerabilities and impacts from these types of projects continue to be ignored in La Paz County since prior socio-economic studies, the BLM used faulty analysis to imply that these projects create positive local economic benefits as the BLM declared for the Solar SEZ project near Brenda. That conclusion was from a study that included California communities who do not provide services for our jurisdiction. That result would not address the fact that the services required by the local government are not being repaid or recovered from any increase in the contribution of revenues from visitors, businesses or industry. The outcome of this in the future will be that projects may be delayed, opposed locally and communities controlled by the BLM made to feel weaker and vulnerable. This is not a pathway towards alignment of goals between federal policy nor does it lead to cooperation and collaboration from the local jurisdiction.
La Paz County Board of Supervisors believes that there are ways to work toward cooperation on massive projects that create negative impacts but do not deliver local benefits. This process must start by identifying appropriate mitigation impact fees that will compensate for the negative impacts from a social, environmental and economic standpoint. Independent to this process, we must find ways to allow the local government to participate in the economics of providing renewable energy in the future through La Paz County owning and leasing property to developments under the same business model that has been shown to be successful for Boulder City in Nevada. The Board of Supervisors have started a parallel process to promote legislative actions that transfer BLM property for use by the County to create a more sustainable local economy and we expect local cooperation from the BLM regional offices to this effort.

The impacts and vulnerabilities that need to be analyzed for the Ten West Line are the outcomes that may result from a number of conditions:

1.) Large transmission lines are the source of serious health concerns, real or imagined.
2.) The public expresses high levels of aversion to such hazards, which leads to qualify of life issues as well as reduction in property values for properties adjacent to or around these lines or visually impacted by these lines.
3.) The level of trust that the public has for the Bureau of Land Management currently does not command confidence that federal policies driving the goals for renewable energy are fairly weighted when it comes to local jurisdictions benefits.
4.) Market forces dictating estimates of cost for the project may need to increase to pay for local impacts by better addressing the priority needs of the community bearing the brunt of the impacts from the project.
5.) Precise socioeconomic forecasts related to the future effects and negative impacts to the local government is extremely difficult to quantify due to the BLM’s refusal to analyze the incremental effects from all of the recent federal policies that together continue to deteriorate La Paz County’s ability to be financially sustainable in the future.
6.) The fact that the BLM controls more than 60% of the property in the County means that the PILT fees available to be collected are reduced due to the population cap placed by the federal government. With only 5% of available private property for taxation purposes, the rest of the property is controlled by either the Federal, State of Tribal ownership. This distribution of property ownership needs to be addressed against the context of current federal activities that undermine our local jurisdiction’s financial vitality.

Project Description:
The future goals, strategies, activities, schedules, and intentions of the Federal Government and the BLM as it relates to national support for large infrastructure projects like the Ten West Link remains uncertain and subject to abrupt change at any time. This condition makes it extremely difficult to make precise socio-economic forecasts for the future effects and impacts to La Paz County whether it is successful or not. National goals of grid reliability, cheap renewable energy and a lessened reduction on fossil fuels are lofty goals driving the federal policies that support development of energy projects but the benefits from these goals are not necessarily being achieved locally.
Economic and Demographic Benefits:

The Ten West Link is designed to benefit California’s power industry. If accomplished, this would improve grid reliability for California residents and increase the capacity to bring more renewable energy to their State on a transmission line owned by a regulatory entity in California. These benefits are made possible by our local communities dealing with these lines on a daily basis. We will not gain access to cheap renewable energy nor will this improve the County’s overall grid flexibility, nor will it create economic development opportunities locally. In some cases, it reduces economic opportunities by lessening property taxes and removing properties from consideration for residential development because developers and homeowners see being close to large transmission lines as a negative. There doesn’t appear to be any benefit of this grid to La Paz County unless certain mitigation efforts are taken or agreement reached to allow the County to participate in economic development opportunities around this line.

In terms of the employment, spending, and income potential in La Paz County, the benefits of construction of the transmission line is negative. Most of the construction labor will come from outside the County. The construction purchasing practices produce few benefits to La Paz County residents because the bulk of goods and services are generally produced and purchased outside the County. There are no fiscal benefits from the Ten West Link because the local economy is designed to collect tax revenues yet the BLM plans to pay PILT which is not even close to what the County would get if this was private property. Because the Ten West Link does not increase the visitor and tourist spending, it does not pay for the public services provided to its employees and contractors. Temporary construction workforces will likely add to crime rates and will require greater levels of law enforcement resources and other public safety services. It has been evidenced in other cases that crime rates and domestic issues will raise in proportion to the population with an influx of temporary laborers working daily in the County. To make matters worse, many tourists will chose to stay away from recreational areas crisscrossed by large transmission lines since it is the pristine desert environment that attracts these visitors. There is the direct possibility of stigmatizing effects on the visitor and tourist industries of La Paz County – one of the only revenue generating industries in the County. A transmission line that covers almost one hundred miles of probably rough terrain will require extensive search and rescue personnel preparation in the event that workers are hurt or harmed. It will mean purchasing aircraft to access difficult areas and training forces to provide services to difficult to reach locations.

Federal Mandate Impacts

Federal PILT provides federal payments to local governments in order to help offset losses in property taxes due to nontaxable federal lands within local governments' boundaries. La Paz County receives no offsets from having KOFA, Cibola, Bill Williams or the military installations within our boundaries. Federal PILT is supposed to help local governments provide firefighting and police protection, construction of public schools and roads, and search and rescue operations. The authorized level of PILT payments is calculated using a complex formula. No precise dollar figure can be given in advance for each year’s PILT authorized level and payment remains uncertain due to political uncertainties. Because of this risk, La Paz County
always feels vulnerable to the federal receipt of PILT monies. For other federal properties that constitute a large proportion of our land base, we receive nothing.

PILT is primarily based on BLM administered acreage, but in lower population counties is capped based on population. This can be interpreted to mean that an increase in BLM lands at the expense of privately held lands does not affect the County financially. However this actually has a negative impact on all taxing authorities, in many cases in excess of $10.00 per year per acre with no additional PILT payment because of the population cap. These amounts have proven to be woefully inadequate to support the jurisdictions' services for our tax payers.

The Socio-Economic Study of La Paz County

The Supervisors request that the socio-economic portion define the activities to be undertaken by the project developer, including the location, number and type of personnel, wages and salaries, other costs, purchases, and expenses, taxes, fees, and other revenues to public funds, schedule of activities, location of activities, distribution of employees to communities, and alternatives to the proposed action. Negative impacts to future economic development should also be analyzed with impacts from the stigma resulting from the aesthetic changes to the desert. In addition, the impacts should all be assessed WITHIN THE COUNTY’S BORDERS. We do not support an economic analysis that includes surrounding Counties that does not include detail specific to La Paz since “the Region” is not responsible for providing the services required in our County.

The Board will submit other questions for a local analysis of the socio-economic study. We request to know which companies or entities are currently being evaluated to conduct the study and request participation in that selection process.

Sincerely yours,

Ms. Holly Irwin
Chairperson, Board of Supervisors

CC:
Mr. DL Wilson (Supervisor, District 1)
Mr. King Clapperton (Supervisor, District 2)
Mr. Dan Field, County Administrator
Ms. Kelly Sarber, Strategic Management Group
Mr. Mike Ford, Abbey, Stubbs and Ford, LLC.
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June 21, 2016

Ten West Link Project  
Joe Incardine  
BLM Arizona Office  
One North Central Avenue, Ste. 800  
Phoenix, AZ 85004

RE: LA PAZ COUNTY BLM PROJECTS

Dear Mr. Incardine:

I was unable to attend the La Paz County Board of Supervisors meeting in Quartzsite on June 14, 2016, however, I did review the document sent to me from them to the McMullen Valley Chamber of Commerce regarding the projects being planned for La Paz County.

While I do think projects, the 114 mile transmission line, solar farm and expansion of the Yuma Proving grounds, like these are a benefit to the area, the benefits seem, in these cases, to be temporary, just during the construction phase. I am hoping a more equitable resolution, not only for the County but also their tax payers, can be reached for long term benefits, creating full time jobs long into the future.

I would be favorable to the approach taken in City of Boulder, Nevada, where legislation was enacted between the Federal Government and the State for local ownership. In return, the County, in this case La Paz, would lease the land for the very same projects presently under consideration thereby enhancing the County's ability to provide necessary services to its citizens and the projects themselves. This would help offset the tax base loss of the Bill Williams River area.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Judie New

cc: La Paz County Board of Supervisors
June 27, 2016

Bureau of Land Management
Arizona State Office
Attention: Joseph Incardine/Ten West Link Project
One North Central Avenue, Suite 800
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Dear Mr. Incardine:

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the June 14, 2016 Economic Strategies Workshop.

The following summarizes Yuma Proving Ground's comments and concerns as discussed at the workshop with respect to impacts to workforce, Ten West Link proposed routes along northern border and a solar panel facility near drop zone. We request the Bureau of Land Management consider them in the Environmental Impact Statement analysis.

a. There are 80 Army Civilian and contractors associated with the work in the Northern Cibola Range area that the powerlines would impact, and encroachment on these test facilities may put these jobs at risk.

b. The Ten West Link Propose Action and Preliminary Alternative Segments map (attached) used at the workshop identifies the routes with another set of labels. Our reservations and concerns continue to be related to the power lines running along our northern boundary line (cb-9, cb-8, and cb-7) which have line of site visibility into the Joint Experimentation Range Complex test facilities for either radio frequency waves or visual observation.

c. The Developer stated that there is a potential to place solar panel facilities near the power lines and emphasized that this might be a positive economic value for the area. However, any solar panels near the drop zones would be a hazard to our developmental parachute jumpers and aircrew; therefore, we would object based on the safety factors related to these operations.

d. The Point of contact for this actions is Mr. David Lewis at 928-328-6639.

Sincerely,

Randy Murray
Colonel, U.S. Army
Commanding

Enclosure
To: Joe Incardine, BLM  
From: Mark & Lynda Goldberg, Quartzsite Residents  
Re: Ten West Transmission Line EIS - Economic Strategy Comments  
Date: June 28, 2016

Dear Mr. Incardine,

We have been coming to Quartzsite since 1986, and became full-time residents in 2007. Quartzsite has been under tremendous stress to maintain its stature as a haven for winter visitors. Quartzsite is unlike any other community and tourism vis-a-vis winter visitors is the mainstay of the local economy. It is important to understand the unique and sensitive economic factors which impact Quartzsite’s economy.

Quartzsite has a large proportion of housing which is owned by “snowbirds,” who come to Quartzsite for the activities and temperate winters, and afford ability. These homes consist of mobile homes on acreage, some conventional housing, and improved individual private lots where owners park RV’s in the winter. These homes sit vacant from April 1 until October/November. The amount can be quantified by active water service payments during the winter months. There is also a huge transient snowbird population, of tens of thousands, which comes to the area’s mobile home parks, and RV parks for the winter season. A third group of snowbirds populates the BLM long-term visitor areas during the same winter season. This area and the RV parks in town seem to be the bulk of the winter population increase.

Winter visitor “stays” have been significantly declining for the past 10 years. The season used to be from October through April. Most of the visitors during that time were from Canada, Washington, Oregon, Wyoming, & Montana, and were retirees in their 60’s+. Due to the aging of that population (now in their 90’s), changes in Canadian insurance, price of fuel, and other factors, this population generally no longer makes the winter trip. This group is slowly being replaced by “Baby Boomers,” who are now of retirement age and are looking for active recreation and a nice winter climate. Instead of staying in one place for the season, they are more transient, looking for a variety of active recreation, and may only stay in Quartzsite for two-weeks to six weeks, before moving on. The 14-day camping limit in many of the BLM LTVA’s probably provides a convenient time-frame before having to move to another spot locally, or just move on to another region. Quartzsite’s winter visitor season has now reduced to a steady, albeit significantly reduced, number of winter visitors between October and March, with the maximum number during the last two weeks of January.

The ‘Temporary residents,’ many of whom are property owners, pay property tax year-around, utilities, and sales tax. There is an indirect benefit to the Town in that since these “residents” are here only a short time, public service needs are minimal when they are gone, yet the revenue stream from property tax is constant. There is an indirect, yet similar benefit of having a large transient population...they come and spend money which generates local revenue, yet generally do not require a large demand for public services. We get the revenue, and do not have to provide significant services.
Most data on housing and demographic data collected by agencies and consultants outside of Quartzsite can generally be considered to be unreliable in that they are generally based on accepted industry practices which do not take into account the unique aspects of Quartzsite’s winter visitor quirks, the unique population described above, and demographic trends which do not show up on traditional census and economic data bases.

The vast majority of the Quartzsite population is retired. The balance is employed by services, government, health care, and special districts. The remaining population is owner-operated local businesses with minimum employees, locally-owned single proprietorships which cater to the RV trade, senior citizens, local maintenance, and similar. The rest work for franchises, fast food, or are unemployed and/or on welfare.

Our visitors come here for the temperate climate, affordability, regional access, and foremost, the scenic beauty of the area.

The most significant overt impact of the Ten West Transmission line is the visual impact upon Quartzsite’s pristine desert’s natural beauty. As stated, the vast population which comes to Quartzsite in the winter is here to enjoy the undisturbed beauty of the local desert. Distant vistas exist with an unobstructed mountain backdrop all around the valley. The power lines are a juxtaposition of ugly, large, urban infrastructure on the otherwise pristine desert environment. The negative visual impact has the potential to adversely impact tourism to Quartzsite.

There are very minimal benefits of the project to Quartzsite and La Paz County. There is no guarantee that locals will be hired for construction. Most construction materials will be purchased out of the area. Some short-term minimal benefit will accrue from local purchases of fuel, food, and lodging. Few long-term jobs will result from the project. La Paz County receives no direct benefit from the transmission line’s power, yet they sustain all of the impacts. BLM is receiving direct, long-term financial benefit from the lease, yet La Paz County derives no financial benefit. Virtually no sub-routes, and few primary route alternatives are presented. The public 8-1/2” x 14” route map available on-line shows no detail and is wholly inadequate to begin to evaluate the local impacts of route alternatives. The impacts to La Paz County, and the demographics are significantly different than the impacts to Maricopa County and Riverside County. The environmental impact assessment should address each area separately, not as a general group.

The Peace Trail is a unique, new off-road regional trail linking Mojave, LaPaz, and Yuma Counties. There are thousands of winter visitors who come to La Paz County to enjoy the beauty of the desert, and off-road touring. Off-road recreation is one of the few areas of the local economy which is expanding. The proposed transmission line is aligned to go up the middle of Johnson Canyon. This area is one of the only “challenging” off-road sections of the entire 750-mile Peace Trail. The proposed construction would destroy the challenging features of the trail by constructing bladed service access roads, and would create significant adverse visual impact in this pristine area. Alternatives should be considered: Alternate route; putting towers on the hillside...
versus canyon bottom; using a few double-circuit towers on the existing power line to carry the proposed line around the canyon. At the very least, mitigation measures should provide a rehabilitated, challenging off-road route to match the original level of challenge, adjacent to the bladed route, or in another area acquired for mitigation.

The local economy of Quartzsite is strongly dependent on tourism generated by our unique desert. Adverse, impacts from the proposed Ten West Transmission Line need to be addressed carefully and thoughtfully to respect to mitigation and minimizing the impact to area tourism and the fragile local economy of Quartzsite.

Thank you for your consideration, we look forward to working with you as the Environmental Review proceeds to develop reasonable alternatives and mitigation.

Sincerely, Mark & Lynda Goldberg