

**MINUTES  
OF THE  
LA PAZ COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
Wednesday, April 13, 2016, 1:30 p.m.  
Worksession**

Chairman Irwin called the April 13, 2016, worksession of the La Paz County Board of Supervisors to order at 1:30 p.m. Elected Officials and Department Heads present were: Chairman Irwin, Supervisor Wilson, Supervisor Clapperton, County Administrator/Clerk of the Board Field, Community Development Administrator Yackley, and Deputy Clerk of the Board Green. Others present were: Kelly Sarber, of Strategic Management Group, representing the County; Mike Wilson, with Abbey Stubbs & Ford, LLC; Katherine Hill and Ellen J. Carr, representatives with Galileo Project, LLC, and Joe Incardine, Bureau of Land Management National Project Manager.

**Discussion regarding the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) proposed Ten West Link 500 kilovolt Transmission Line Project**

Joe Incardine, National Project Manager of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), stated that he is traveling to a variety of locations in Blythe, CA, La Paz County and the Phoenix area to conduct a 45-day “public scrutiny period”, to hear from public and cooperating agencies, which include the tribes, for feedback on the Ten West Link 500 Project. He stated that the project starts near Tonopah; heads West, North of Interstate 10; heads West to Kofa, ending at the Colorado River substation.

He added that the feedback period will end on May 9, 2016, and in early 2017, there will be a draft published; and a decision made in 2018 on the project. He stated that BLM is working closely with the California Public Utilities Commission and the local cooperating agencies for information. He further stated that the “decision maker” with BLM would be the Arizona State Director and the Yuma Field Manager.

Kelly Sarber, of Strategic Management Group, representing the County, stated that Arizona has become increasingly popular for renewable energy sources, noting how government entities are becoming involved in associated projects and asked how the local jurisdictions could “align” with these efforts for a “win, win” situation for everyone involved.

Mr. Incardine explained that the BLM is the lead agency as it concerns other governmental entities as cooperatives, and expressed that they “don’t yet know what we don’t know”. He reiterated that they were in a fact-finding stage.

Discussion ensued at length speculating on the type of lease that would be offered the project; term options considered, the policies that would be in place for negotiations; and the possibility of including the whoppa lines into the negotiations.

Katherine Hill, representing the Ten West Link project, stated that, since it will affect the I10 corridor, the public just inside the Maricopa County border where RV parks and other residents are located, were notified in their outreach and will continue to be in their ongoing campaign in these areas.

Chairman Irwin stated that there was a great deal of off-highway vehicles (OHV) activity in the County from winter visitors who assist the economy in La Paz County. She added there may be need of a current socio-economic study to determine what impact there will be. She described the 2003 study as “severely outdated”.

She added that she was aware that BLM is implementing approximately 15 travel management plans through Arizona, one planned in the Quartzsite area; and with this additional project, there are concerns that there will be a definite impact to the economy in this area.

She stated that she had concerns relating to the Peace Trail development, which she has been involved and included three counties.

Mr. Incardine and Ms. Hill stated that there would be a workshop held that would be more “scoping” and should address the socio-economic issues.

Ms. Sarber stated that a regional impact analysis has already been requested for the BLM solar energy zones, looking at where workers would come from, whether the county would acquire these jobs, the issues of providing social services, the impact of removing these lands from the public; where “at the end of the day it’s negative” although BLM talks of it as “positive”. She felt that there needed to be a “meeting in the middle”.

Mr. Wilson assured the Board that there would be mitigation plans and possible alternate plans, acknowledging there are “cumulative” aspects that are concerning.

Ms. Sarber stated that she had prepared a draft “executive summary” relating to this and other BLM projects and the common issues. She added that she was not trying to be “difficult”; however, felt the county needed to receive fair compensation.

Discussion briefly ensued on the disproportionate compensation received from public land use relating to PILT (payment in lieu of taxes) from the State; and suggestion of the possibility of putting participation in the project “on the table”.

Mr. Incardine assured the Board that the project would not affect anything relating to the PILT received.

Supervisor Clapperton asked if the project would incur any eminent domain situations on private property.

Ms. Hill stated that the project is a private development; therefore, any easements needed would have to be negotiated at/from fair market value, and it would be up to the development to accomplish that since it does not have a “utility” status.

Discussion ensued reiterating the impacts to the County on BLM projects that eventually surface; noting that typical “benefits”, such as work provisions, are short term.

Ms. Hill described the structures that would be constructed and offered to provide copies of the structures.

Ms. Sarber asked that the County’s IT person be contacted with information as to how the County could be included in the negotiations with large solar developments being considered for this line.

Supervisor Clapperton stated that he felt this project would be an opportunity for BLM to instill confidence with the public over the rumors that have been circulating over the last few years.

Mr. Incardine expressed appreciation at the County being a cooperative agency and stated that draft impact statements would be provided which could possibly contain some of the socio-economic aspects that concern the County.

He added that telephone calls will be made monthly to the cooperating agencies for input; and suggested there be a designated person of contact; as well as “focus discussions” regarding the issues. He requested a letter designating the person of contact.

Ellen Carr, representing Galileo Project, Inc., suggested that the public be given the BLM website address if there were any questions about the project. The public will be able to comment and received updates by email and mail.

Discussion ensued on various persons the Board asked that be contacted to assist the project managers and who would be a good source of information.

Chairman Irwin stated that some residents will be coming back in October and would want to comment on their concerns.

Ms. Hill stated that the line would increase reliability and feed power to Arizona as well as California, which is the primary consumer.

A brief discussion ensued regarding Plan amendments the County had, noting the Community Development Administrator Yackley had intentions for amendments, especially in the OHV areas.

