

**Magma Energy U.S. Corp.**  
**625 Piñon Court**  
**Ridgecrest, CA 93555**

April 11, 2008

Office of the Honorable Harry Reid  
U.S. Senator  
Attn: Matt Tuma  
400 S. Virginia St., Suite 902  
Reno, NV 89501

Subj: Designation of Wilderness Lands in Nevada

Dear Senator Reid:

Recent proposals by the Nevada Wilderness Project to set-aside nearly 700,000 acres of Federal public lands, in addition to the more than 3 million acres already in wilderness status, creates a disturbing picture for the future. Magma Power is opposed to such a set-aside, and offers the following in consideration.

U.S. Public Law 88-577, Section 2(c) provides a very specific definition of wilderness lands with which much of the already designated wilderness does not comply. It is short-sighted and irresponsible to be locking-up additional public lands that may have mineral and/or energy potential in the future at a time when the country is facing staggering costs associated with rising prices for energy and natural resources.

The U.S. is presently forced to rely on expensive and increasingly difficult to obtain sources of energy and strategic minerals from abroad. Continued withdrawal of public lands for wilderness study or wilderness designation will result in serious shortages of areas that could provide homegrown renewable or hydrocarbon energy at a crucial time in our history. Beyond this pressing need, there is the fundamental issue of whether we really need additional wilderness lands at all. It seems this initiative to put more public lands in wilderness status is a placebo being offered to environmental groups by our lawmakers rather than being one of vital national interest.

It has been suggested that studying these lands for mineral and energy potential would settle the issue of whether they have future potential. That is most assuredly not the answer. During the period of time they are being studied, which will amount to several years if past actions are any indication, the lands are taken out of consideration for any exploration or development activity. Besides, no one has a perfect ability to predict what these lands might yield, nor do they know which land use will be most beneficial in the future. How, then, can we responsibly lock them behind a virtual iron gate as regards current or future use?

No reasonable person can argue against protecting lands that meet the letter and spirit of the Wilderness Act of 1964. We do, indeed, need such places where man can enjoy the

unrivaled beauty of our natural world, and there are many that are already in that category. The John Muir Wilderness, for instance, is one of our most spectacular and priceless natural resources that is enjoyed by many every year, including myself. That said, there are far greater expanses of land including the Golden Valley Wilderness and the El Paso Mountains Wilderness in east-central California, along with countless acres in all of the western U.S., that virtually no one visits.

There are good and valid reasons to have lands set aside for the quiet enjoyment of our citizens. There are equally valid, and more pressing, reasons to open as much of our public lands to multiple land use as possible. Protectionism is not a sound public policy; conservation (wise use of our natural resources) is.

Very truly yours,

*F.C. Monastero*

Francis C. Monastero, PhD  
President

Cc: The Honorable Jim Gibbons, Governor of Nevada  
Dr. Curtis Robinson, Geothermal Resources Council  
Karl Gawell, Geothermal Energy Association  
Alan Coyner, Nevada Division of Minerals  
Emery Thran, Coalition for Public Access