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SCOTT FLORENCE: If I can have everybody's
attention, I'd like to welcome you to this meeting,
this scoping meeting for the West-Wide Corridor Study
Project. My name is Scott Florence. I'm the
District Manager, relatively new district manager
from the Arizona strip district which is
headquartered in St. George, Utah. And I'm sort of
filling in for Juan Palma who is the local BLM field
manager here in the Las Vegas field office.

I just wanted to welcome you all to the
meeting. Thank you for coming out. And this is the
eighth I believe of eleven similar meetings
throughout the Western United States to take public
input and provide an opportunity for us to have some
dialog with you, hopefully be able to answer some of
the questions you have so you can provide some
informed comments during the scoping period. And it
also will be an opportunity for you to provide oral
comments, oral testimony at this meeting.

So I'm going to turn the meeting over to
Jerry Pell from the Department of Energy, and he's
going to be the moderator for the meeting. He's
going to explain how the meeting is going to be
conducted. So, Jerry, I'll turn it over to you.

JERRY PELL: Scott, thank you very much.
I'm not going to make this so formal. I'm just going
to talk from here and keep it a nice, relaxed, casual
meeting.

As Scott mentioned, I'm Dr. Jerry Pell. I'm
with the Department of Energy in Washington, D.C.,
and the office I'm with is the Office of Electricity
Delivery and Energy Reliability, or OE as we call it
in Washington. Everything has an abbreviation in
Washington.

It's a pleasure to be in Las Vegas. I've
been here several times before and I always enjoy
coming back. It's never the same city twice, is it?
So we always do find new and exciting things to see
and do.

Speaking of Vegas, this is one of those rare
occasions where what's done in Vegas will not stay in
Vegas. We do have a court reporter, and the point of
that is to make sure that your comments and remarks
today are recorded faithfully so that we can study
them later and consider them in the course of
preparing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Before I proceed with introducing the panel,
let me just tell you how I plan to conduct this so
that you know what to expect. First thing I'm going
to do is read some introductory background remarks
that I've been asked to share with you on the reason
why we're here, what this is all about, then I'm
going to introduce the remainder of my panel from the
Fish and Wildlife, I'm sorry, from the Forest Service
Office Department of Agriculture and from Bureau of
Land Management Department of the Interior. I said
Fish and Wildlife Services because I'm involved with
them on another project and I've been exchanging
e-mails and so I guess it sticks in the mind.

After having done that I will ask the
audience whether does anybody here that's politically
elected, any congressmen, senators, governors, people
of that nature that would like to speak, and if there
are none I will then continue with people who have
preregistered, and after their remarks I will then
ask you all if anybody would like to speak from the
audience.

Once we've exhausted all our commenters, we
will close out the formal record and those of you
that would like to stay and engage in informal
conversation with us, we're going to stay here as
well, because we have another meeting as 7:00 so
we're not going anywhere, and we'd be delighted to
chat with you.

So having said all that, let me tell you why
we're here. The three agencies that I mentioned before, Energy, Land Management Department of the Interior and the Forest Service Department of Agriculture together are going to prepare what's called a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. And that terminology stems from the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, N-E-P-A as many of you know it.

And the point that document is to evaluate environmental and cultural issues associated with the designation of energy corridors on federal land in the eleven western states. And based upon the information and analyses that are developed in this Programmatic EIS, the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service would amend their respective land use plans by designating a series of energy corridors.

And it is that program that's referred to when we call it a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, I should clarify, as opposed to what some of you may be more familiar with the project specific environmental analysis, or EIS, where you actually study an actual project that has an actual geographic location and that can be considered specifically with regard to a specifically proposed energy path or...
corridor. This is a Programmatic EIS that precludes
and precedes practice specific environmental
analysis.

Your participation is very important because
we're counting on you to give us the input we need to
define the scope of the analysis, and that's why this
is called a public scoping meeting. It literally is
exactly that. The development, preparation of this
PEIS stems from the Energy Policy Act that was just
signed on the 8th of August. It's public law 109-5A,
also known as House resolution 6.

Section 368 of that Act directs the
secretaries of Agriculture, Commercial, Defense,
Energy and the Interior to designate under their
respective authorities corridors on federal land in
the eleven western states: Arizona, California,
Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon,
Utah, Washington and Wyoming for oil, gas and
hydrogen pipelines and electricity transmission and
distribution facilities. These are the energy
corridors.

And the three agencies together have
determined that designating these corridors
constitutes a major federal action which may have a
significant impact upon the environment within the
meaning of, as I mentioned before, the National
Environmental Policy Act, hence the requirement to
prepare a Programmatic EIS.

DOE and Bureau of Land Management are
co-lead agencies, and Agriculture is participating as
a cooperating agencies. The three of us together are
working as a team, and the other part of that team,
the fourth leg of this four legged chair, if you'd
like, is the public.

There are four ways to submit comments, and
whichever way you choose is entirely in your
convenience. It does not make any difference which
way you comment. All comments will be considered to
the same degree whether they come in electronically
through the web or by mail or by facsimile or by
speaking here or by FedEx or UPS or what have you.

So do not hesitate after today to submit
comments if you have any in writing or
electronically, and also through our website, which
you may not be able to see because it's at the very
bottom of this chart, but let me please bring to your
attention the address of that website is corridor
EIS, one word, c-o-r-r-i-d-o-r-e-i-s, dot ANL.
That's Argon National Laboratory. This is the
national lab of the Department of Energy that's
preparing the actual EIS for us, dot gov, as in
government.

So please become familiar with that website.
It will get updated as the project continues.
Transcripts of these eleven days of scoping will be
available on that website.

The actual public scoping comment period
ends on November the 28th, but we always make sure
that we note that if we can get any comments after
that date they will be considered to the extent
practicable. And that means that if we haven't
gotten to the stage in the document where it's to
late to make changes, we will consider late comments,
but I would still encourage you please help us or
work with us by getting your comments in by
November 28th if at all possible.

I discourage you from using regular mail to
send comments to the Department of Energy, and the
reason for that is we go through anthrax screening
which has two marvelous effects. One, it delays our
mail by a couple of weeks. Two, when it does arrive
it's quite often damaged.

The anthrax screening process has a tendency
to fuse together the pages, and I've received more
than one package that I've opened and immediately
disposed of because I couldn't separate the pages.
So please use the regular mail as your last resort.
If you do want to use mail, I encourage you to use
one of the overnight services light FedEx or Emery
Air Freight or what have you.

I want to thank you for being here. I'm
gratified by the number of you that have chosen to
join. And at this point I would like to introduce
our panel. First on my right is Scott Powers with
Bureau of Land Management, and then Paul Johnson with
the Forest Service. I will let these gentlemen speak
for themselves. I understand Scott has a few remarks
he wants to share with you as well.

SCOTT POWERS: They'll be very brief. Thank
you for coming on behalf of BLM. We've been talking
about doing this for a long time. And there are
several familiar faces in the crowd that are going to
help us get it done, and I'm glad to see you here.

I wanted to say something briefly about the
map, because all maps draw attention in these kind of
processes, and I just wanted to make sure people
understand what it is and what it is not.

What it is is a bunch of lines on a map
drawn by a bunch of people that would like to see
corridors in those locations some day. And we
provided that just to illustrate the point that there's a lot of interest in this out there. Nothing more, nothing less. There's been no analysis done on any of those proposals. So, you know, take it for what it's worth. It clearly demonstrates how interested people are in this project.

Also we'll be glad once the recorder is turned off to answer any questions you may have. A lot of times, especially in the beginning of the scoping process, you need clarification in order to help you provide, you know, valid comments, and we'll be glad to do that and then you can come back on the record and provide comments that way if you want afterwards. But as Jerry mentioned, there's several other ways to provide those comments. So thanks again for being here.

PAUL JOHNSON: Again, my name is Paul Johnson. I'm representing the Forest Service from the Washington office. And again we are thankful and appreciate that you are here to garner your input into helping us move forward in meeting the challenge that Congress laid on us when the President signed the bill.

And we recognize that this is an important piece of work and also it will -- your input is
valuable in helping us as the five agencies: The Department of Energy, Interior, Commerce and Bureau of I guess Defense and Agriculture in coming up with some valid corridors that would be very useful to the people out here that are going to be serving in the future. So we look forward to your comments, and again thank you for coming.

JERRY PELL: Thank you, Scott and Paul, appreciate that.

As I said earlier, let me now ask is there by any chance an elected official amongst the audience that would like to speak, either state, federal or local?

Is there anybody from one of the government agencies, again federal, state or local, that would like to speak that's with us this afternoon?

Okay, seeing that there are none I have three preregisterants that I will start with, and I will then ask if anybody wants to say something to us from the audience. Let me start first with Kris Hohenshelt with Kern River Gas Transmission Company. And, Kris, forgive me if I pronounced that.

KIRS HOHENSHELT: No, you did fine.

JERRY PELL: Thank you. Come up to the podium please and make sure that our court reporter
has your name, first and last spelled properly.

KRIS HOHENSHELT: Good afternoon. My name is Chris Hohenshelt. I'm the manager of Land and Environment for Kern River Gas Transmission Company.

Kern River Gas Transmission Company owns and operates 1,679 miles of interstate natural gas pipeline through the states of Wyoming, Utah, Nevada and California. Approximately 850 miles are located on federally managed lands. Kern River transports a design capacity of 1.7 billion cubic feet of natural gas per day.

Kern River appreciates the opportunity to participate in this important endeavor being undertaken as mandated in the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

The study, hopefully resulting in the establishment of better defined and expanded energy corridors, is critical to the economy and well being of the western United States.

I spoke in Salt Lake City, presented some comments regarding some of the principles that we would hope to be used in looking at corridors, establishing corridors and I will not repeat those comments today.

The proposed Programmatic Environmental
Impact Statement should assess corridors with
traditional multiple use principles and evaluate any
constraints or restrictions that could impede this
initiative. More specifically many corridors are
restricted by competing land use designations. Here
in the Las Vegas area there is a corridor that is
used for electric transmission through the Sunrise
Mountain Instant Study Area. This area supposedly
has the same protections as a Wilderness Study Area,
but through congressional actions electric
transmission has been allowed through the Sunrise
Mountain Instant Study Area. This corridor can only
accommodate what congress has specifically allowed.
This position has been affirmed by the Department of
Interior's Solicitor through correspondence with the
Bureau of Land Management and Kern River.

The Programmatic EIS should specifically
address this situation and hopefully through ultimate
approval of the corridor PEIS, specific congressional
action will no longer be necessary. Kern River
supports the actions the Bureau of Land Management
has taken to date. The BLM, through its Resource
Management Plan, EIS and Record of Decision
identified the need for a corridor through the
Sunrise Mountain Instant Study Area and recommended
it to be utilized as a multiple use corridor.
However the BLM also recognizes that congressional
action is necessary before its resource management
plan proposal can be implemented.

It is essential that a multiple use corridor
be established in this area for energy transportation
through the Las Vegas metropolitan area. Kern River
supplies approximately 75 percent of the natural
consumed in the Las Vegas area and nearly 25 percent
of the natural gas that enters the state of
California, and that's through its existing pipeline
system. Expansion of energy transportation systems
to meet the growing natural gas demands in these
areas becomes more difficult without the
establishment of effective corridors. The opening of
the Sunrise Mountain corridor will allow growth and
supply of Rocky Mountain natural gas as well as other
energy sources to Las Vegas and California.

As we all know, the Las Vegas Valley is
rapidly being developed to the point that placement
of interstate energy transmission systems is a
challenging proposition. Kern River has studied
numerous corridor scenarios in this area and has
concluded that city infrastructure and the Red Rock
National Conservation Area to the west are
constraints that must be overcome if a corridor is not developed to the east of Las Vegas in the area of the Sunrise Mountain Instant Study Area.

In closing, Kern River supports your efforts in studying and hopefully establishing effective energy corridors in the west and would specifically urge you to address the Sunrise Mountain corridor issue.

JERRY PELL: Thank you very much.

KRIS HOHENSHLENT: Thank you.

JERRY PELL: I appreciate your remarks.

We'll certainly consider them. And I also want to thank you for giving us a written copy of your remarks. And if there are any additional remarks you care to submit in writing, we'd certainly appreciate that.

KRIS HOHENSHLENT: Kern River will submit formal copies.

JERRY PELL: Thank you. I'd now like to call on our second preregistered speaker, Pat Arons of Southern California Edison. And, Ms. Arons, I'd like to ask you, I had as a preregistrant Nat Nguyen. Are you replacing Nat Nguyen this afternoon?

PATRICIA ARONS: Yes, I am.

JERRY PELL: Okay. Thank you. Miss Arons,
would you make sure please that we have your first
name, first and last name properly spelled for the
court reporter.

PATRICIA ARONS: My name is Patricia Arons,
P-a-t-r-i-c-i-a, A-r-o-n-s. That's one A.

Edison would like to commend the joint
agency approach to undertaking designation of
corridors. I believe it's a very important process
for ensuring and preserving our ability to build
energy infrastructure into the future, so my
compliments undertaking this. And I believe that
you'll find that it's going to have a very enduring
impact on the energy industry.

I'd like to begin my comments by suggesting
that you think about some expected outcomes of
designating energy corridors. From Edison's
perspective as we look at increasing load growth in
Southern California and increasing transmission
related services to new market based generation and
new renewable regeneration what we see is that
there's tremendous pressure to build new transmission
to meet these obligations for the future.

So the expected outcomes that we would like
you to begin to focus on would be to expedite
environmental permitting for new projects as they
cross federal land. And in helping that, interagency protocols would be useful so that as you have a single project that involves use of different federal lands under different agency jurisdiction, having a set of protocols would greatly ease the burden on utilities in accomplishing and developing a particular project.

We'd also ask that this process take into consideration planned projects that utilities are beginning to look at. At Edison we have our transmission grid under the control of the California Independent System Operator. And through that process of working with ISO related staff we look at a planning horizon that is generally a ten year planning horizon but we also try to incorporate into our thinking long-term needs as to what we think the growth requirements would be out for 20 years. So begin to think about the time horizon in which you're designing corridors for the future.

And I think one other point in terms of a designated outcome to be thinking about is those federal policies that will preserve our ability to build energy infrastructure through federal corridors is going to be very important. And I get into that later on in my talking points.
We've got some comments included here on the importance of a sufficient corridor width, and I talk a little bit about how wide that should be. A single transmission line might require right-of-way width of 200 feet. And if you're talking about multiple transmission lines, you don't always site those transmission lines immediately adjacent to each other, as I discuss, because of the liability vulnerabilities that you can actually build into the system.

But we're suggesting that from the perspective of electric infrastructure you think about corridor widths that are about a mile wide. And that would give us opportunity to put two lines adjacent to each other with a third line having about a 2,000 foot separation for liability reasons.

And we have, at Edison we use a 2,000 foot separation as kind of a benchmark that came out of the planning of the California/Oregon Transmission project. It was an activity that was undertaken in the mid '80s I believe where we looked at separating a third 500 KV line from the Pacific Northwest which was the existing two 500 KV lines had a capability of transporting 3200 meg watts from the Oregon area down into California, and the project was the third 500 KV
line.

And in the course of doing the studies we found that if there were a common event that could effect all three lines simultaneously, that we had some very adverse consequences that we were dealing with. So separation of those electric facilities became a critical issue. And as we look at energy corridors for building transmission, you really do need to incorporate in your thinking some sort of standard for separation so that you do not build in vulnerabilities into what you're doing.

And I do have a copy of that corridor separation report that was prepared for the California energy -- I'm sorry, for the California/Oregon transmission project that will give you some background and thinking. Actually discussed in that report was very -- I'm going into this elaborate because I actually wrote the report for the committee and spent a lot of time researching reliability and where it really came from.

But stemming from the 1965 blackout there was a great report that was written by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission as a report to the President, and it really talked about one of the recommendations was getting adequate separation for
reliability reasons. So I would direct you or
suggest that you perhaps include that in your
comments. I think another --

JERRY PELL: Excuse me, Miss Arons, will you
be able to provide us with a copy of that report for
the record?

PATRICIA ARONS: We'll attach it to our
formal comments that we plan on filing.

JERRY PELL: Excellent. Thank you.

PATRICIA ARONS: I may actually be able to
get my hands on the original 1965 report to the
President that was published by the Federal Energy
Regulatory Commission. That would be another useful
document to refer to.

The other suggestion that we included here
in our talking points is that security of course
today is a big concern. And as you go about
publishing information, making it generally
available, I think you want to be somewhat guarded
about designating corridors for specific energy uses.
In fact, I would suggest you don't even designate an
energy corridor, that you designate it as a corridor
and deal with the issue of what it is used for on a
case-by-case basis.

I think also coordination with state, local
and tribal government agencies are very important. In California we have adopted -- the state has adopted a renewable portfolio standard that requires utilities to purchase up to 20 percent of their energy needs from renewable resources by 2017, although they're talking about accelerating that to 2010. I don't know if that's happened yet. I haven't really followed that that closely.

But what's important about that is renewable resources tend to be remotely located. They require substantial transmission to connect to the utility grid, and they're going to in all likelihood go to federal land.

The state of California actually is, stemming from their renewable portfolio standard, is considering undertaking an activity to do corridor designation on state land. And one of the things that would be a useful outcome from a utility perspective is to have some sort of alignment so that you can coordinate use of federal corridors with state corridors and assure access between the two. You don't want to see a north/south corridor across federal lands and an east/west corridor immediately adjacent over state lands that make it almost impossible to make access to the two readily.
available.

Tribal governments I think are looking at first of all, they have extraordinary energy resources that are beginning to be developed. And I believe that it's really important to incorporate tribal energy development and tribal meetings into this process.

Federal policies that I think were particularly interested is that as we develop energy corridors at the federal level, access across private lands to be able to access those corridors become critical. And growth as developed in more and more remote areas tends to close off corridors. And so we have policies both at the state and federal level that limit our ability to carry property in rates unless they're associated with a particular project.

And I think that if we had a federal policy that was in alignment with a corridor designation process that would say that incorporates in particular you could hold right-of-way in rates in order to access those federal corridors for the eventual development of a transmission facility. So federal policy that would encourage and preserve that ability would be particularly important.

Your schedule is very optimistic. In
California spring bloom is critical in any environmental assessment that we do. And any new corridors that are developed included in your Draft PEIS for the spring of this year won't have spring bloom data in all likelihood. And you might want to think about data adequacy and valid designation of these corridors as being an important part of what your goals should be.

We own extensive transmission facilities, and it's important to us to preserve our ability to use our existing corridors through federal lands. And we think it might be a sensible thing to do to define corridors around existing facilities that would at the very least allow us to site new transmission adjacent to existing facilities, or at least within some reasonable separation for reliability.

I've listed on my talking points some particular federal lands that we had major transmission through where we're particularly concerned about our ability to build in the future as well.

And finally I would suggest that we consider a periodic review of this. This is going to be a very valuable process as time goes by and the world
changes. I'm a transmission planner and I can tell you every year I deal with a new set of facts as I do my work. And so you need some sort of periodic update, and I would suggest perhaps a five to ten year cycle that would ensure that the designated corridors are consistent and meet or satisfy the energy development needs in the west.

So I thank you for allowing me to perhaps go over my five minute limit by a few minutes, and I appreciate the opportunity to comment.

JERRY PELL: Thank you. Thank you very much. Very valuable comments. I especially appreciate the comments on corridor width because this has been a technical issue we've been struggling with at DOE in previous NEPA documents as to what constitutes an appropriate corridor for study. So your remarks and whatever information you bring to bear on that subject will certainly be available.

And thank you again for that corridor separation report in advance for when we get it. And I also want to thank you for enlightening me about Indian tribes. I did neglect to ask whether there were any Indian tribal representatives present that wish to speak, for which I apologize. Are there any?

Okay. Thanks again, Ms. Arons.
We now move on to our third speaker, Mike Avant, is it? And, Mr. Avant, I'm not quite sure the name of the company. Is it Garkane Energy?

MIKE AVANT: My name is Mike Avant here for Garkane Energy. Garkane Energy is a small electric cooperative in contrast to the two previous speakers. It represents large multistate, or within a state, organizations.

Garkane serves about 10,000 customers in south central Utah, north central Arizona. We have about 2,000 miles of line, and we have the dubious distinction of serving more state and federal parks, monuments, forest service installations than any other utility in the country. Approximately 90 percent of our service area of lands are controlled by one form of government or another. We serve Bryce Canyon National Park, north rim of the Grand Canyon, Zion National Park, Dixie National Forest, Fish Lake National Forest. So we're neck deep in this issue.

There again I think you have a very, very aggressive schedule and I hope very much that you hold to it. We have right-of-ways for existing transmission lines on the Dixie National Forest that we filed for renewal of those transmission lines in December of 2002. The right-of-ways expired in
December of 2003. This is almost December of 2005. No action has been taken on those renewals. Forest Service tells us that they have no budget for handling right-of-ways. So I hope you can seriously fix that problem.

In looking at your website I see nothing on it that tells me how to submit or get corridors that I think should be designated put onto your map. Your map is I think primarily a project or product of the WSEC and is looking at large multistate projects, but I represent the exact opposite: The small local projects, the distribution type projects that bill also intended this process to cover. And we need some way that's relatively easy and straightforward to get our desired corridors onto this map so that they can get equal consideration with the large Kern River and multistate type projects.

We have previously submitted desired corridors to other federal agencies during land use plan preparation, most recently the Grand Staircase National Monument when their management land was developed over the last few years. Not only did the information we present on corridors that needed to be looked at get ignored, they also ignored and don't recognize existing 230 and 500 KV transmission lines.
So I hope in this process that at least we can recognize existing facilities and designate corridors along these existing facilities.

But we need to be very careful in putting all of our lines into single corridors in an area as has been demonstrated in the Southeast United States. A single storm can wipe out all of the facilities serving large areas if they're all in the same corridor together.

So I sincerely urge you to break with the existing Forest Service philosophy if there's an existing line, any new lines will be right next to that existing line and separate them so that a single tree falling over won't wipe out all of the power to Southern Utah. Thank you.

JERRY PELL: Mr. Avant, thank you very much. I appreciate that. I would invite you to chat with us after we go off the record and discuss all your concerns and perhaps we can help you help us with your proposed corridors. But I would just say in general, use the comment process just as described on that poster at the back of the room and let's talk after the formal --

MIKE AVANT: Okay. Thank you.

JERRY PELL: -- part of the meeting.
Mr. Avant was the last individual that had
preregistered to speak, and we're now at that stage
where I would invite anybody joining us this
afternoon that would like to speak to please just
raise your hand, come up here and join the party.

Madam?

THALIA DONDERO: Just brief remarks from
listening.

JERRY PELL: Sure. That's what we hope is
that when you hear what's being said, even though you
may not have intended to speak, that it will inspire
you to greatness. Please tell us your name for the
court reporter.

THALIA DONDERO: My name is Thalia Dondero.

JERRY PELL: Could you spell that for us
please.

THALIA DONDERO: T-h-a-l-i-a, Dondero is
D-o-n-d-e-r-o. I've spent a lot, over 60 years in
Nevada, so I have been on the parks department and
also county commissioner for 20 years and now I'm a
regent for the university system. I also serve as
chair of your outside Las Vegas program which deals
with all of the federal agencies.

But I noticed that in the map and where it
comes across and there are a lot of concerns that I
have. Of course I like the fact that you have
somebody that talks about designating a corridor.
And through the Ely area there's a lot of mines, a
lot of caves, a lot of state parks. And I think
hopefully you've taken those into consideration when
you're doing that.

Also Sunrise Mountain was an old dumpsite,
and hopefully you know that. But I think that the
corridor is needed and that we need to proceed with
it as quickly as possible because the growth in the
area has been so tremendous.

But I thank you for having the comment
period. Thank you.

JERRY PELL: Thank you.

Who else would like to join us this
afternoon with some remarks? This is your chance to
be heard, folks. We came a long way, some of us from
D.C. to be with you so don't hesitate to please, as
this gentleman is doing, take advantage of the
opportunity.

JUAN PALMA: For the record my name is Juan
Palma, spelled J-u-a-n, P-a-l-m-a. I am the field
manager for the Las Vegas field office here in Las
Vegas.

JERRY PELL: I'm sorry, the field office of?
JUAN PALMA: Field office manager for the BLM here in Las Vegas.

JERRY PELL: Thank you.

JUAN PALMA: I was supposed to be here earlier but the traffic was a little terrible. Just when I thought I was going to be on time, I got cut off in traffic. But welcome to Las Vegas. Welcome to this part of the country.

A couple of comments that I'd like to make on the conversation thus far is we consider this corridor and right-of-way is a tremendous workload for us in Las Vegas. We have literally hundreds and hundreds of right-of-ways. Right now on deck we have about 1300 right-of-ways of different sizes, maybe not as big as what we're talking about here for Las Vegas.

We have tremendous workload in our BLM field office when it comes to RPP leases, which is called recreation public purposes leases. As we consider the larger right-of-ways, the larger right-of-ways that we're talking about here, I would like for the group and the body to consider also our wilderness areas to make sure that those corridors in the wilderness areas are accounted for.

The second thing is what we in the BLM call
the areas of critical environmental concern, or ACECs for short. You probably ought to consider where those things may be. We have those ACECs, and especially on the Sunrise Mountain area and other parts of the BLM. So we probably ought to consider some of those areas as well as we're looking at the map and looking at the corridors.

Those are some of the comments I have. Our recreation areas, we, the BLM, serve a broad spectrum of public. And one of those public that we serve is our recreationists out there. BLM is continuing to expand our recreation programs. Whatever we do in terms of corridors, I think we need to account for the services that we provide to our recreationists out there on the BLM lands, especially a lot of our recreationists use the right-of-ways. They actually use the roads under the power lines for their recreation activities. So keep that in mind as well.

We continue to expand the city, especially Las Vegas. As the city continues to expand, then we continue to encroach on some of the recreational sites that many people have used for years. Perhaps we can marry up some of those right-of-ways with some recreational activities. I think that would be a good thing to have.
Always continue to look for ways that we can provide recreational sites for our clients and customers. So keep that in mind as you consider the various widths of the right-of-ways, the various locations of the right-of-ways, how can we marry those recreational activities with those right-of-ways. Those are a few of my comments and thank you for listening.

JERRY PELL: Thank you for addressing us. I would mention, by the way, that recreation is one of the areas within the scope of the document. I see some other people looking like they are very interested in chatting with us. Would you come up here and share your views, anybody? No takers? Going once. Nobody? Going twice.

Okay. If you insist on keeping your remarks secret, we will dismiss the court reporter, go off the formal record and just engage in congenial chitchat with you if you'd like to stay and talk with us informally.

And Scott has just asked me to open it up to questions, and he's more than willing to discuss Q and A with you. And let's just do that right now. So let me thank Debbie for helping us today with the record, and the record will now close. Thank you.
(Thereupon the proceedings
were concluded at 2:45 p.m.)
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