Introduction & Summary

Chairman Byron Dorgan, Vice-Chair John Barrasso, and other members of the Senate Indian Affairs Committee, I appreciate your attention to this vital issue, and your fact-finding efforts to develop legislation to support Native American and wider regional efforts to foster sustainable development. Native American lands now lie at the center of discussions and potentially efforts to meet the economic and cultural needs of tribal communities, and offer an opportunity for partnerships to contribute to wider North American energy sustainability and independence.

My laboratory, the Renewable and Appropriate Energy Laboratory (RAEL) has experience in the design and implementation of clean energy building systems (both new buildings and retrofits) as well as specific technology solutions (solar thermal, photovoltaics, waste to energy, marine energy, wind and hydro power) in over 20 countries (detailed online at http://rael.berkeley.edu). I have worked with the U. S. Department of Energy to develop curriculums and to provide outreach support to the tribal colleges and tribal energy officers for the Native American Renewable Energy Education Project (NAREEP), and am currently working with two Native American communities, the Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians (Tuolomne, CA) and the Cedarville Rancheria Band of Northern Paitue Indians, to plan and implement low-carbon, pro-growth energy and economic plans.

In the case of this testimony I am truly honored to support directly the extensive efforts of Ms. Reba Fuller and the Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians who are looking at clean energy projects on their tribal lands to not only meet local energy needs as well as to provide clean energy generation for sale to the regional utility. Many of my comments today are in the spirit developed by the Me-Wuk in their vision of an agenda of local, regional and national economic growth, job creation, and an export-oriented industrial base.
The Context of High- and Low-Carbon Energy

America is at an energy crossroads. As a nation, we are dependent on fossil fuels at a time of growing demand and dwindling supply. Meanwhile, fossil fuel use continues to impose massive environmental and economic costs. Now our country must choose between paying to continue the status quo and investing in a new energy future.

Enabling the transition to a more sustainable energy economy has become central to public and private sector discussions of our future (Augustine, 2005).

Environment California recently released a study, which concluded that:

The costs of continuing on our current energy path are steep. American consumers and businesses already spend roughly $700 billion to $1 trillion each year on coal, oil and natural gas, and suffer the incalculable costs of pollution from fossil fuels through damage to our health and environment. If America continues along a business-as-usual energy path, U.S. fossil fuel spending is likely to grow, totaling an estimated $23 trillion between 2010 and 2030 (Environment California, 2009)

A diverse set of studies from academic groups, to industry and venture capital teams, to overseas governments have all weighted in on the cost/benefit ratio of this process, but at the very least, agreement exists that paths to a low-carbon economy do exist and that an interaction of science, technology, and policy actions would be needed to make this a reality.

At present the economic assessments of the benefits or costs of greatly expanding the low-carbon energy sector. My laboratory has taken part in a study that for California, achieving a 25% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2020 would create over 80,000 new jobs (Kammen, 2007), a finding confirmed by quite different modeling methods (Roland-Holst, 2006).

Findings: Clean Energy as an Economic Driver of Sustainable Native Peoples Projects

The first and most important finding is that Native American lands are the sites of some exceptional solar, wind, biomass and hydropower resources, as well as traditional – and in many places controversial – uranium and coal mining, ecologically problematic hydroelectric facilities, and fossil-fuel power plants. In these brief comments I will not explore in detail the opportunities for expansion of carbon-intensive energy production (or resource mining) on Native American lands that here-to-fore has been the status quo. This is largely because the environmental (both local and global) imperative to develop scenarios of low-carbon growth not only presents challenges, but more importantly, a substantial opportunity to develop new economically powerful yet sustainable industries to meet Native American and wider North American energy needs.

Key findings and recommendations from the work of my team at RAEL include:
• **Energy Poverty Exists and Must be Addressed for Many Indigenous Peoples:**

Significant energy poverty exists on many Native American lands, which impacts families basic well-being, health, childhood and life-long education, and the ability of women, children, and men to achieve their potential (107th Congress, 2002; and CCR, 2003). Electrification rates on some tribal lands are on par with some of the poorest nations on the planet. This is true, ironically, even where the tribe overall is rich in energy resources for export to the United States (EIA, 2000; Middleton, 2008). This situation is not acceptable or necessary.

**Recommendation:** Energy efficiency programs, from the targeted sale or distribution of efficient stoves, boilers and furnaces, air conditioning, lighting, and transportation are largely lacking on Tribal Lands (Elliott, 1998; CERT, 2005). First and foremost, education and access to efficient technologies is needed, and, if sustained, would save families, businesses, and tribal administrations tremendous amounts of money, prevent illness, and improve school and working conditions for millions of Native Peoples (107th Congress, 2002; and CCR, 2003).

• **Clean Energy Resources are a Unique and Largely Untapped Resource for Tribal Peoples:**

Study after study has found that wind, solar, biomass and other low-carbon resources are abundant – even uniquely so – on Native American lands (Middleton, 2008). Navajo, Crow, Zuni, Rosebud, Me-Wuk and other tribes all have some of the best renewable energy resources in the world. There have been more than enough resource studies to initiate solar, wind and biofuel resource extraction to meet Tribal and potentially larger North American energy goals. The National Renewable Energy Laboratory here in Golden and Boulder, Colorado, have documented these resources to an exceptional degree [http://www.wrapair.org/tribal/](http://www.wrapair.org/tribal/). The rough estimate that 10% of total North American energy resources are found on the 5% of land which is tribally held or managed has remained a rough but accurate indicator of the diversity and richness of this resource (Middleton, 2008).

In many cases, the issues are not the total amount of clean energy resources, but the constraints of insufficient capital to begin the harvesting process, uncertain markets for clean energy, and lack of long-term partnerships to access these resources in ways that treat the Tribes as equal partners in the management of these new resources. Some programs, notably at NREL and within the Bureau of Land Management/Indian Affairs do exist to build these linkages, but considerably more could be done.

**Recommendation:** Partner with Tribal nations and bands to examine the opportunities for new financing mechanisms that access clean energy resources and preserve both tribal autonomy and commercial energy generation once local needs are met.

• **The Expansion and Upgrade of the Transmission System Critically Impacts Native American Clean Energy Development:**

Of all the technologies, grid extension and direction to harvest clean energy resources is perhaps the most critical and capital intensive issue facing the Tribes. Grid extension to and through Tribal lands is today a complex, time consuming and expensive process that requires partnerships, trust, and
shared goals between all parties. These resource issues are described in some detail in the next section.

**Recommendation:** Make grid-expansion and ‘Smart grid’ test-beds that integrate tribal energy resources a Tribal and national priority.

**Detailed Analysis of Clean Energy Resource from Tribal Lands**

Economic modeling of Western power production and usage reveals that the most cost-effective power production choices for many States are derived from renewable sources. Preliminary results from the Switch model developed in my laboratory suggests that the optimal power investment for California (as an example, the largest power market in the US west) would generate at least 40 percent of renewable electricity by roughly 2025, while increasing both imports and exports with adjacent states.

Expansions in the capacity of existing high-voltage transmission lines and some major new high-voltage lines, mostly in and out of the Central Valley, would be needed regardless of the Renewable Portfolio Standard target. But choosing different targets changes the mix of generation resources that transmission will tap and can tap in the future. Once transmission is permitted and built, after financial and political capital is expended, the new lines shape the future economic landscape and define choices for electricity generation. The transmission decisions that flow from a higher RPS enable greater choice, dilution of permitting and cost risk, and lower mid- and long-term costs.
Figure 1: Current power transfer capability on the western high-voltage grid (red) and Switch build out (gold) by 2022 under $0/tCO₂ scenario to enable the new clean energy generation shown in Figure 2. *Note: the key power lines to build (yellow) are largely from areas of exceptional wind energy resources on or near Native American lands to the large urban centers of western U. S.*

The timing and magnitude of these transmission investments can vary considerably with the deployment of distributed generation and investment in energy efficiency. Our model, Switch West, calculates an optimal portfolio with a small but strategic role for distributed PV, supplying only 4 percent of California electricity from rooftop solar panels by 2020 but higher amounts in critical spots, for example, close to 10 percent of total demand for Los Angeles Department of Water and Power from mid-decade onward.

A regional depiction of economically optimal power production for an average hour in 2022 can be found in Figure 2, with renewable sources limited to types of wind turbines, solar thermal plants and solar panels available today. The $0/ton CO₂ carbon price bar presumes no additional climate policy is put in place through 2022.
Figure 2: New energy generation deployed by 2022 under two carbon price scenarios, $0/tCO₂ and $40/tCO₂ (with the price enacted by 2014). Legend shows the three key deployments, solar PV, wind, and solar thermal. Note: The low deployment of clean energy within Utah reflects availability of inexpensive coal at the mine-mouth and transmission of renewable generation from surrounding states.

The need and timing for transmission investment also varies with less certain development of other domestic renewable sources. The Crow, Navajo, Rosebud and many other reservations are the sites of some of the most exceptional solar and wind resources on the planet.
Expanding the use of renewable energy is not only good for our energy self-sufficiency and the environment; it also has a significant positive impact on employment. My students and I have examined the observed job growth in a number of technology sectors (Kammen, Kapadia and Fripp, 2004; Kammen, 2007; Engel and Kammen, 2009; and online spreadsheets to calculate job creation: http://rael.berkeley.edu/node/517).

We reviewed 13 independent reports and studies that analyzed the economic and employment impacts of the clean energy industry in the United States and Europe. These studies employ a wide range of methods, which adds credence to the findings. In addition to reviewing and comparing these studies, we have examined the assumptions used in each case, and developed a job creation model which shows their implications for employment under several future energy scenarios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy Technology</th>
<th>Source of Estimate</th>
<th>Average Employment Over Life of Facility (jobs/MWa)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction, Manufacturing, Installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV 1</td>
<td>REPP, 2001</td>
<td>6.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV 2</td>
<td>Greenpeace, 2001</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind 1</td>
<td>REPP, 2001</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind 2</td>
<td>EWEA/Greenpeace, 2003</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomass high estimate</td>
<td>REPP, 2001</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomass low estimate</td>
<td>REPP, 2001</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal</td>
<td>REPP, 2001</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>Kammen, from REPP, 2001; CALPIRG, 2003; BLS, 2004</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Average employment for different energy technologies. “MWa” refers to average installed megawatts de-rated by the capacity factor of the technology; thus, for a 1 MW solar facility operating on average 21% of the time, the power output would be 0.21 MWa. References in parentheses and sources refer to the studies reviewed in the text. The biomass energy studies are a proxy for jobs that could derive from an expansion of biofuels (e.g. ethanol use) in regional or the national energy mix (Kammen, et al, 2004).
Figure 3: Comparison of the estimated employment created by meeting the equivalent of 20 percent of current U.S. electricity demand via and expansion of fossil or renewables-based electricity generation. These totals use the jobs per megawatt numbers from Table 1. These scenarios are for different fuel mixtures that could comprise a federal Renewable Energy Portfolio Standard.
A key result emerges from our work, and can be seen in Table 1. Across a broad range of scenarios, the renewable energy sector generates more jobs than the fossil fuel-based energy sector per unit of energy delivered (i.e., per average megawatt). In addition, we find that supporting renewables within a comprehensive and coordinated energy policy that also supports energy efficiency and sustainable transportation will yield far greater employment benefits than supporting one or two of these sectors separately. Further, generating local employment – including that in inner-cities, rural communities, and in areas in need of economic stimulus -- through the deployment of local and sustainable energy technologies is an important and underutilized way to enhance national security and international stability. Conversely, we find that the employment rate in fossil fuel-related industries has been declining steadily for reasons that have little to do with environmental regulation.

The U. S. Government Accounting Office conducted its own study of the job creation potential of a clean energy economy (GAO, 2004). In an important assessment of rural employment and income opportunities, they found that:

… a tribe, farmer or community who lease land for a wind project can expect to receive $2,000 to $5,000 per turbine per year in lease payments. In addition, large wind power projects in some of the nation’s poorest rural counties have added much needed tax revenues and employment opportunities.

Technology exports have impacts well beyond domestic job creation. In fact, if properly managed, the development of a thriving ‘cleantech’ sector can address a vital global issue, namely the emissions trajectories of major developing nations. Native peoples are ideally places to access and manage these resources to meet local and regional clean energy needs.
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