November 23, 2005

Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability
Room 8H-033
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, DC 20585

And via Fax: (202) 586-1472

RE: DOE West-wide Energy Corridor Programmatic EIS - "Designation of Energy Corridors on Federal Land in the 11 Western States" (DOE/EIS-0386)

To Whom It May Concern:

It is our understanding that the Department of Energy (DOE) is preparing a West-wide Energy Corridor Programmatic EIS ("Designation of Energy Corridors on Federal Land in the 11 Western States" (DOE/EIS-0386)) (Energy Corridor PEIS) pursuant to National Environmental Policy Act. Based upon the information and analyses in that Energy Corridor PEIS, we are aware that each federal agency involved in the program (namely BLM and USFS) would be required (in accordance with the Section 368 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005) to amend their respective land use plans by designating a series of energy corridors. Those corridors, once designated, could then be developed to support oil, gas and hydrogen pipelines and electricity transmission and distribution facilities. No specific information has been provided regarding the location of proposed transmission corridors, and thus no analysis of site-specific impacts or assessment of consistency with local plans and policies has been provided.

An energy corridor is most often identified through a land use planning process that establishes a preferred location for both existing (co-located) and future (above and below ground) utility right-of-ways. Planning and development of energy corridors in Napa County should only occur with broad public input and only if consistent with local land use policies.

On May 3, 2005, our County Board of Supervisors unanimously voiced its opposition to future construction of electrical transmission corridors without local control to California State Senators by opposing SB 1059 (authored by Escutia and Morrow). Our Board of Supervisors appreciates the need to plan for potential future transmission requirements, but feels that new transmission facilities should occur in areas of the where population and load growth is most likely to occur. Napa County is dedicated to agricultural preservation and has a number of voter-initiated slow-growth policies in place (Measure A, Slow Growth Initiative and Measure J, Agricultural Lands Preservation Initiative). As a result, we do not foresee a future need for significant increases in energy capacity or transmission systems.
Furthermore, our General Plan contains specific policies with regard to energy corridors and is currently being revised to include more explicit guidelines in this matter. Our County Code (Zoning Ordinance) also has special provisions to protect the scenic quality of the County for the enjoyment of its visitors and residents and to address issues related to excavation and erosion control. These special provisions ensure that the existing landscape fabric of the County’s hillside areas are protected, and that significant resources are preserved.

We understand the importance of the energy issues facing California and the western United States, and recognize the need for prudent energy planning. However, new or expanded energy corridors in Napa County could have a number of significant impacts upon our environment and should be pursued only in concert with local authorities. We would appreciate notification of any future potential energy corridor designations within or adjacent to Napa County.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Hillary Gitelman
Director,
Napa County Conservation, Development and Planning Department

cc. Diane Dillon, Chair, Napa County Board of Supervisors
    Nancy Watt, County Chief Executive Officer
    Patrick Lowe, Deputy Planning Director, Conservation Division
    Terrence O’Brien, California Energy Commission