

**Public Hearing on
Energy Policy Act—Section 368
Energy Corridors in the West:
Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement**

Seattle, Washington, January 10, 2008, 2:00 p.m.-5:00 p.m.

Darby Collins: Thank you for joining us today for a public hearing on the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement on Designating Energy Corridors on Federal Lands in the West. My name is Darby Collins and I'm with the Department of Energy and I'll serve as today's hearing officer. And before we start the formal hearing, I'd like to introduce Rob Iwamoto who is the forest supervisor here in Seattle with the Forest Service and he's going to give us a brief opening statement. Rob?

Rob Iwamoto: Okay, thank you Darby. Good afternoon everybody. Thank you for coming to give your comments here for this hearing on the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement—so I'll apologize for reading off a script here—for the Designation of Energy Transport Corridors on Federal Lands in the West and I suppose I was asked here because obviously the Mount Bakers don't call me as immediately as the adjacent to the Seattle metro area.

So my name is Rob Iwamoto. I'm the forest supervisor for the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest and basically that goes from the Canadian border down to in the proximity of Mount Rainier.

In a few moments you'll hear a brief presentation about the document, which the Department of Interior, Energy and Agriculture are preparing to meet requirements in the Energy Policy Act of 2005. Currently applications for rights-of-ways to cross federal lands with pipelines or electric transmission infrastructure are considered on a case-by-case basis without much coordination amongst the various federal agencies whose lands are often involved in projects that transport energy across long distances.

In 2005, Congress directed federal agencies to address this situation by designating energy transport corridors and also performing necessary reviews of the environmental impacts of designation. A Programmatic EIS—EIS is the Environmental Impact Statement—developed under the National Environmental Policy Act—the acronym we use is NEPA—represents that environmental review.

It is important to note that another round of site-specific NEPA analysis will be completed for each project proposed for location in a designated corridor. The Department of Energy, the Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Forest Service developed the corridor locations proposed in the Draft Programmatic EIS using a three-step process which is detailed in the document—by the way you'll be getting handouts of these items as well—in a handout available on the information table, which is in the back I believe, and which the presentation we'll also describe later on here tonight.

In essence, today's brief hearing represents step four in that process. Public comments will help the agencies further refine the locations of corridors so that important goals of the project are met. And those are balancing the needs to improve energy delivery in the West with our responsibility to protect the many resources found on federal lands. From

the beginning the agencies have been committed to this strategy and your comments will be valuable in helping to ensure that it is carried through to the end of this planning effort.

Argonne National Laboratory is assisting the Department of Energy, the Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Forest Service in preparing this Programmatic EIS. Representatives from all three agencies and Argonne are here to receive your comments.

Thank you again for your interest and participation and so Darby with that, hand it back to you.

Darby Collins:

Thanks. So as mentioned, this is a public hearing and it's a formal hearing so what we'd ask—we've asked folks to sign in in the registration. Most of you have all signed in and if you'd like to speak, we feel free to go back if you decide you didn't sign up to speak and you'd like to speak, go back to the back registration table and sign in and we'll move from there.

And, as Rob mentioned, we have the information on the fact sheets and all the maps and information to the right there on the back table.

In the room with us today, and there are two gentlemen standing up talking in the back, are part of the interagency team who worked on this. So Ron Montagna—wave—is from the Bureau of Land Management and Glen Parker is from the Forest Service, and we will be around through the entire hearing process. And the way this will work is we'll take formal statements. Right now I have one speaker signed up, and then we will just basically adjourn the kind of formal webcast piece and stay here and if anyone—we'll be here through the full length of the time till five o'clock, discuss whatever you want to talk with the folks back there.

If someone wants to make a public statement, we will reconvene it and go back on webcast and make formal statements. So we're here and we'll handle that as need be.

As we mentioned, we're here today to receive oral comments on the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. You can also submit comments via the project website, by fax or by mail. This hearing is being webcast and transcribed so all speakers are asked to come up, speak into this mike, speak as clearly and directly as possible. If anyone has any problem, if I can't hear you, I'll just notify you of that so we'll just ask you to move the volume up a bit.

After everyone has commented and spoken and we're done, we'll close the hearing at 5 p.m. today and there's a second public hearing from 6 to 8 this evening.

So as we've all been talking about, this is to take comments on the Draft Programmatic EIS that was prepared in response to direction given by Congress to five federal agencies under the Energy Policy Act of 2005. And this really addresses section 368 of that Act. And Congress' direction to those five federal agencies: Energy, Agriculture, Interior, Commerce and Defense, directed the secretaries of those agencies to designate corridors for oil, gas, hydrogen pipes and electric transmission lines on federal land in the 11 western states; to also perform necessary environmental reviews such as this PEIS that's the subject of the hearing, and incorporate those designations into land use, land management and equivalent plans.

And a separate and distinct public process is expected to begin later this year to identify corridors in the other 39 states.

And before I go on, I also forgot to introduce John Krummel who's up here working the PowerPoint. He's with Argonne National Laboratories and helped us prepare the Programmatic EIS. Sorry about that.

Okay, under the statute, the statute requires that when the Secretaries designate these corridors, they must specify the corridor centerline, width and compatible uses. Congress also directed the Secretaries to take into account the need for electric transmission facilities to improve reliability, relieve congestion and enhance the capacity of the national grids to deliver electricity.

The Draft PEIS proposes designating more than 6,000 miles of corridors; 62 percent would incorporate existing, locally designated corridors and/or rights-of-way; 86 percent would be on BLM land and 11 percent on Forest Service land.

The Draft PEIS identifies 166 proposed corridor segments in all 11 western states. In all—if all are included in the follow-on decisions, this would involve amending 165 land-use or equivalent plans.

Previously designated corridors are outlined in yellow on the project maps. Some of these are proposed for upgrade only. In the case of existing previously designated utility corridors, amendments to land-use plans designating 368 corridors would subject these corridors to the interagency coordination process described in the PEIS. And they would be assigned section 368 criteria, for example, centerline width and compatible purposes.

Using these alone would not meet the requirements of section 368 so we've identified an additional 2,300 miles of proposed corridors. Proposed corridors also vary in width. We used a 3,500 foot starting point to provide flexibility for siting multiple rights-of-way. An energy corridor is defined as a parcel of land identified through a land-use planning process as a preferred location for existing and future utility rights-of-way and that it is suitable to accommodate one or more rights-of-way which are similar, identical or compatible. Corridor designations assist in minimizing adverse impacts and the proliferation of separate rights-of-way.

A right-of-way is a separate land use authorization, not a change in ownership, that's granted to allow construction and operation of a specific project that's often linear in character, such as a utility line or a right-of-way—or a roadway. Right-of-way permits include requirements for compatible land uses and are not granted until a project applicant has complied with all relevant requirements, including appropriate environmental review.

In November 2007, we published this Draft PEIS and comments are due on February 14th. We will analyze the response to your comments and complete the tasks necessary to prepare a final PEIS. We expect to have that ready sometime in mid-2008. The land management agencies will then be able to sign records of decision to designate corridors through amendments to their land-use plans no sooner than 30 days after the final PEIS is issued.

The Draft PEIS analyzes two alternatives: taking no action and the proposed action. Choosing to adopt the no-action alternative would result in continuing ad hoc, uncoordinated development as is done now. The proposed action is the result of a three-step corridor siting process described in detail in Chapter 2 of the Draft PEIS.

The first step was to incorporate comments provided by the public during scoping and after the Draft map was published in 2006. Then the agencies worked closely with local federal land managers to accommodate local land-use priorities, incorporate local knowledge of areas and avoid areas known to be incompatible with energy corridors. A handout summarizing this process for determining where the proposed corridors would be located is on the information table and examples of specific corridors are also available on the project website.

We believe that the analysis of these alternatives meets NEPA—or the National Environmental Policy Act's requirement for a hard look. Because the proposed action does not involve any site-specific ground disturbing activity, site-specific NEPA review will be required to support all proposed projects in a 368-designated corridor. And today we don't know when or where any projects will be proposed by applicants seeking to site pipe and/or transmission lines. As a result of this uncertainty, the environmental effects described in Chapter 3 of the Draft PEIS are necessarily more general than a site-specific analysis for a known project would be.

Comments will be most useful if they are specific, include suggested changes or methodologies, provide a rationale for your suggestion and refer to the specific section or page of the Draft PEIS. Finally, we encourage you to submit comments via the project website. Hopefully it's easy for you to do it that way. It will speed up our ability to get comments into the database for analysis and up on the website for public review, and it doesn't require stamps or an envelope.

So the way this will work is I'll call the speaker in order that they registered. Please step up to the microphone and clearly state name and/or organization if you represent one before making any comments. While the agency representatives won't be answering any questions during the hearing, we'll stay afterwards for as long as we need to answer any questions that you have.

So are there any questions on how we're going to proceed? Yes, sir.

Male: (Inaudible)

Darby Collins: Correct. Okay. And since you are our first speaker, Daniel Walters. The microphone if you—

Daniel Walters: Good afternoon. Can everybody hear me okay? My name is Dan Walters. I work for the state of Washington, Department of Natural Resources, and I am one of the folks that works on rights-of-ways throughout the state. My objective coming here today is to find out more about this—which I have. I've read the Draft PEIS so I'm aware of that and I wanted to also ask some leading questions.

Briefly, the Department of Natural Resources owns over two million acres of trust lands. We manage for a variety of resources including timber, gravel. We have leases—agricultural leases. We have communication sites. We have oil and gas leases. Very busy, and we manage these trust lands for over 40 trust beneficiaries in the state of Washington: hospitals, penitentiaries, schools, universities and counties. So we have quite a large management responsibility.

So my question after reading the documents and exploring the GIS data on the website, I think my leading questions would start with an example. I do have one here I'll show you briefly when I leave here. One of the most important things for managing our trust lands

is to know what's coming our way. We don't have a problem with the corridor in itself; we need to know where it's coming and the widths.

In downloading the information, we overlaid it in a section/township range, which is fine. We used that, but my strong suggestion would be is to connect the dots. It's not going to do us any good whether we're a private company, work for the Department of Transportation. There's an individual here also seeking more information. So that is one of the most strongest questions/points that we need to have and hopefully you'll be able to do that, more of a leading question next step.

My other question/concern would be after talking with Glen today, he mentioned that 3,500 feet corridor width is the starting point. I thought that was the max. Maybe I read incorrectly. But that's what we'll need to know too. If it's coming through our landscape, instead of stopping at state grounds, estimate where that line you think would go. Granted it's on paper. It gives us an idea.

Also we'd like to know what is the width in that particular area. Granted it is a leading question; you may not have that information right now, but that's what we're going to be needing. So I made some contacts here with Jim down in Fort Lynn and that will be helpful for us as well.

So that's my main comment/question: connect the dots. Okay, and the width parameters, give us some more information on that and maybe, like I said I read it incorrectly. If it's—Glen was saying it's over 5,000 feet in Colorado. What's the max in Washington State? Very helpful for us to know.

My other questions are relating to the communication process when you have project applicants coming through, and I understand totally this is getting the federal ducks in a row first—makes sense. Get the corridors lined out. We need to know kind of where you go from there and I just wanted to clarify and make sure, reassured that when applicants are coming through they contact the state of Washington and other entities within the state. Maybe we can coordinate a little bit here so it's more of a one-stop shopping, I don't know. But we'd like to be able to coordinate that as well. It makes all the sense in the world to do that.

Let's see. And it's important in the granting of easements; it's encumbering our state trust lands. We are not allowed to give encumbrances away. There's a lot of constitution and statutes regarding that matter so we would be needing compensation apparently from the project applicants, I'm assuming that. But we want to make sure that all those processes are in place and be reassured.

Let's see. And the stakeholders, and I think, and I'll just finish up my questions and comments. What would be good, if we can possibly pull it off, is to have all the stakeholders, not just the federal ones, but the state, within the state agencies counties, cities, private companies if it's a warehouses being one, timber outfit here, all very good. Aquatic lands is another thing. I read—I believe it's—what is it, 300 miles or something that's owned over aquatic land. Our aquatic folks would like to know where those areas are as well and how they plan on connecting, so all very good information.

At this point I don't have any other questions and I will leave my business card here with the map as an example and hopefully you can share some answers and comments back. Thank you very much.

Darby Collins:

I have another speaker signed up. Ronald Richards.

Ron Richards: My name is Ron Richards. I live in Port Angeles, Washington. I'm here as a private citizen and this is sort of embarrassing to me because I expected to sit here for a couple of hours and learn more about this PEIS before I spoke on it.

But I'm a chemical engineer by background. I once founded a company called Western Gas Resources, which is a very—was a very large metro gas producer and LNG producer, primarily in the mid-continent states. It was acquired last year by Anadarko Petroleum. I'm definitely not speaking for Western and/or Anadarko today.

But having been in the natural gas business, I was somewhat familiar with the need to permit pipelines and in my estimation the procedures that existed for permitting pipelines were adequate as they are and they allowed for thorough environmental review without any need to fast track. And as I see this proposal, it's one mechanism which would fast track pipelines and perhaps subject them to less environmental review, which I think is a bad and unnecessary idea.

Also, I don't think we need any more oil and natural gas pipelines. We're talking about the need to reduce Co2 production by 90% in the next 50 years or less and permitting more natural gas and oil gas pipelines does not help that. Now I notice in the description you do throw in hydrogen pipelines and whether or not those will be necessary is of some question. Perhaps we will be distributing electricity for hydrogen generation rather than distributing hydrogen or else it will be distributed in surface tension type containers where you can put more hydrogen in a tank car than you can now put gasoline or things like that.

And so I just wanted to go on record as saying I doubt the need for permitting or improving the speed at which oil and gas lines are permitted and I would encourage you to look very closely at the no-action alternative because of climate change. Thanks.

Darby Collins: If there are no speakers at this point in time, we will take a brief—well, we will adjourn the formal hearing process. Basically we put the webcast on pause and at any point in time if someone decides or someone comes and they'd like to speak, we'll reconvene. And then the folks are back there to talk, so we will take that—we will close that part of it right now. Thank you.

Seattle, Washington, January 10, 2008, 6:00 p.m. -8:00 p.m.

Darby Collins: Hey, good evening everyone and we're going to get started here. Thank you very much for joining us tonight and this is a public hearing on the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement on Designating Energy Corridors on Federal Lands in the West. My name is Darby Collins. I'm with the Department of Energy and I'll serve as today's hearing officer.

This is a formal public hearing and we'll operate it as such and before we begin the hearing, I'm going to introduce Rob Iwamoto who is the Forest Supervisor here for the Forest Service and he's going to say a few words of brief introduction and then I'll do a quick presentation and walk you through how we'll run the public hearing. Rob.

Rob Iwamoto: Okay, thank you, Darby. Good evening. If you would just bear with me I have a script here that I wanted to greet you on and looks like we might have a lot of time for us to interact. Nevertheless, good evening and thank you for coming to give your comments on the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the Designation of Energy Transport Corridors on Federal Lands in the West. And my name is Rob

Iwamoto. I'm the forest supervisor here for the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest and I think I was asked to greet you all just because of our proximity of our federal lands here within the Puget Sound.

In a few moments you'll hear a brief presentation about the document, which the Department of Interior, Energy and Agriculture are preparing to meet requirements in the Energy Policy Act of 2005. Currently, applications for rights-of-ways to cross federal lands with pipelines or electric transmission infrastructure are considered on a case-by-case basis without much coordination amongst the federal agencies whose lands are often involved in projects like the transport energy across long distances.

So, in 2005 Congress directed federal agencies to address this situation by designating energy transport corridors and also performing necessary reviews of the environmental impacts of designation. So a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement—EIS—developed under the National Environmental Policy Act—some of you may know this as NEPA—represents that environmental review.

It is important to note that another round of site-specific NEPA analysis will be completed for each project proposed for location in a designated corridor. So in other words, if it's here in the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie, we would do that site-specific analysis. The Department of Energy, the Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Forest Service developed the corridor locations proposed in this Draft Programmatic EIS using a three-step process which is detailed in the document in a handout available on the information table back here in the right corner and which the presentation will also describe so that'll be the PowerPoint presentation coming up next.

In essence, today's hearing represents step four in this process. Public comments will help the agencies further refine the locations of corridors so that important goals of the project are met—balancing the needs to improve energy delivery in the West with our responsibility to protect the many resources found on federal lands. From the beginning the agencies have been committed to this strategy and your comments will be valuable in helping to ensure that it is carried through to the end of this planning effort.

So the Argonne National Laboratory is assisting the Department of Energy, the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service in preparing the final—excuse me—the Programmatic EIS, so the final Programmatic EIS. Representatives from all three agencies and Argonne are here to receive your comments.

And so with that I'd like to thank you for your interest and participation and I'll hand it back to Darby.

Darby Collins:

Just a few quick introductions for you all. To my left is John Krummel. He's with Argonne National Laboratories as Rob talked about. And in the back, right there in the middle is Rob—Ron Montagna who is with BLM. He's one of the participants on the study. He was a key—he's a key player in that as is Glen Parker to his left with the Forest Service.

So we are here today to receive your oral comments on the Draft Programmatic EIS. You can also submit comments via the project website, by fax or by mail. This hearing is being webcast and transcribed so speakers are asked to speak clearly and distinctly into the microphone. If you're having trouble hearing a speaker in the room, please let me know.

After everyone has spoken, I'll take a pause for the meeting. We will be here till 8 o'clock and if anyone else comes to speak, we'll reopen the webcast and take those comments.

This hearing is to take comments on the Draft Programmatic EIS prepared in response to direction given by Congress to five federal agencies: Energy, Agriculture, Interior, Commerce and Defense. Under section 368 of the Energy Policy Act the secretaries were directed to designate corridors for oil, gas, hydrogen pipe and electric transmission lines on federal land and in the 11 western states, also to perform necessary environmental reviews such as this PEIS, the subject of this hearing, and also incorporate these designations into land use, land management or equivalent plans.

A separate and distinct public process is expected to begin later this year to identify corridors in the other 39 states.

The statute requires that the Secretaries designate these corridors, and that they must specify the corridor centerline, width and compatible uses. Congress also directed the secretaries to take into account the need for electric transmission facilities to improve reliability, relieve congestion and enhance the capacity of the national grids to deliver electricity.

The Draft PEIS proposes designating more than 6,000 miles of corridors; 62 percent would incorporate existing, locally designated corridors and/or rights-of-way; 86 percent would be on BLM land and 11 percent on Forest Service land.

The Draft PEIS identifies 166 proposed corridor segments in all 11 western states. If all are included in the follow-on decisions, this would involve amending 165 land-use or equivalent plans.

Previously designated corridors are outlined in yellow on the project maps. Some of these are proposed for upgrade only. In the case of existing previously designated utility corridors, amendments to land-use plans designating 368 corridors would subject these corridors to the interagency coordination process described in the PEIS. And they would be assigned section 368 criteria, for example, centerline width and compatible purposes. Using these alone would not meet the requirements of section 368 so we've identified an additional 2,300 miles of proposed corridors.

Proposed corridors also vary in width. We used a 3,500 foot starting point to provide flexibility for siting multiple rights-of-way.

An energy corridor is defined as a parcel of land identified through a land-use planning process as a preferred location for existing and future utility rights-of-way and that it is suitable to accommodate one or more rights-of-way which are similar, identical or compatible. Corridor designations assist in minimizing adverse impacts and the proliferation of separate rights-of-way.

A right-of-way is a specific land use authorization, not a change in ownership, that's granted to allow construction and operation of a specific project that's often linear in character, such as a utility line or a roadway. Right-of-way permits include requirements for compatible land uses and are not granted until a project applicant has complied with all relevant requirements, including appropriate environmental review.

In November 2007, we published the Draft PEIS. Comments are due on February 14th. We will analyze and respond to your comments and complete the tasks necessary to

prepare a final PEIS. We expect to have this ready sometime in mid-2008. The land management agencies will be able to sign records of decision to designate corridors through amendments to land-use plans no sooner than 30 days after the final PEIS is issued.

The Draft PEIS analyzes two alternatives: taking no action and the proposed action. Choosing to adopt the no-action alternative would result in continuing ad hoc, uncoordinated development as is done now. The proposed action is the result of a three-step corridor siting process described in detail in Chapter 2 of the Draft PEIS.

The first step was to incorporate comments provided by the public during scoping and after the Draft map was released in 2006. Then the agencies worked closely with local federal land managers to accommodate local land-use priorities, incorporate local knowledge of areas and to avoid areas known to be incompatible with energy corridors. A handout summarizing this process for determining where the proposed corridors would be located is on the information table at the back of the room and examples of specific corridors are also available on the project website.

We believe the analysis of these alternatives meets NEPA's requirement for taking a hard look. Because the proposed action does not involve any site-specific ground disturbing activities, site-specific NEPA review will be required to support all proposed projects in a 368 designated corridor. And today we don't know when and where any projects will be proposed by applicants seeking to site pipe and/or transmission lines. As a result of this uncertainty, the environmental effects described in Chapter 3 of the Draft PEIS are necessarily more general than a site-specific analysis for a known project would be.

Comments will be most useful if they are specific, include suggested changes or methodologies, provide a rationale for your suggestions and refer to the specific section or page number of the Draft PEIS.

Finally, we encourage you to submit comments on the project website. Hopefully it's easy for you. It speeds our ability to get comments into the database for analysis and up on the website for public review, and it doesn't require stamps or an envelope.

So the way the hearing works is I will call the speakers who have registered in the order that they registered. Please step up to the microphone and clearly state your name and/or organization if you're representing one before making any comments. And while the agency representatives won't be answering questions during the hearing, we'll stay afterwards, and after we adjourn to discuss anything for as long as you need to be. And so we will do a brief adjournment until someone else wants to speak.

So currently I have two registered speakers and I will start and I will call you and then if you'll come up here and speak. And to begin with, Patrick Goldsworthy. That's you.

Patrick Goldsworthy: (Inaudible)

Darby Collins: Right now. Right up here if you can.

Patrick Goldsworthy: Well this is a cold opportunity for me. I didn't know there was going to be a hearing. This whole process is brand new to me. I don't know where the corridors are or where the suggestions are made. I can offer some general comments at this time because I want to look at details to see what specific comments.

Who I am is the chairman of the North Cascades Conservation Council. I've been that—in that organization for over 40 years and we've worked very intensely with areas in the Cascades of the state of Washington and very much involved in the creation of North Cascades National Park and many wilderness areas in the state of Washington.

So I want to see what these proposals of energy trans—corridors would do to existing parks and wilderness. But in addition to that, I want to see what the potential would be for impacts on forest service roadless areas because we are planning and we are in the action of working out for public knowledge and comment and congressional information on further wilderness areas in the state of Washington located in a number of the forest service roadless areas.

So I'm just speaking in general now because I don't know the specifics that I would comment on and we will officially from our organization make some comments.

Now there was a hearing, a public hearing like this this morning. I don't know who came to that hearing. I have no idea. I may be duplicating what was being said by people in my area who were said this morning. But I'm giving you the major input I would make this evening is we are concerned with roadless areas and some of the roadless areas may have proposed energy corridors in them.

That's all I can tell you. Thank you very much.

Darby Collins:

Kurt Conger

Kurt Conger:

My name is Kurt Conger. I'm a consultant in the Seattle area. I did work for the U.S. Department of Energy on the transmission congestion study that was performed under the Energy Policy Act of 2005. I currently work for Seattle City of Light as a transmission engineer and transmission issues analyst and I was asked to attend this meeting tonight to state some of the concerns that Seattle City Light has regarding corridor designations.

I've worked, as I mentioned earlier, on fairly significant transmission congestion studies in this region. This past summer, Seattle City Light faced quite a few transmission curtailments, which altered the operating plans of the utility and the most economic dispatch of our resources. As a matter of background, over 70 percent of the electrical energy used by consumers in the city of Seattle and most of the adjacent utilities, Puget Sound Energy and Snohomish County PUD, must cross the Cascades in order to reach consumers in this area.

The existing transmission corridors that cross the Cascades over Stevens Pass and Snoqualmie Pass are essential to reliable service to consumers in this area and we need to consider certain factors in the designation of new corridors or the management of those existing corridors. And I noticed from the map it appears that the only corridor designation of significance on your map is going over Stevens Pass where it appears to be a modification of an existing corridor or perhaps widening that corridor.

As loads and the number of consumers, that is population, economic growth and other factors contribute to growth in the Puget Sound area, most of the utilities in this area by state law must now rely on renewable resources which are predominantly located in eastern Washington, eastern Oregon, Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho, which implies that if those resources are to be delivered to electric consumers in Seattle and the Puget Sound area, they must cross the Cascades over transmission lines.

The existing transmission lines have become somewhat problematic. They are decades old; this past summer, we had extended periods of transmission outages in order to do necessary maintenance on those facilities. Unfortunately, when you take a facility out of service, it congests the system and alters the operating plans of utilities and at some point new facilities must be constructed. Okay.

In order to construct new facilities, you can't simply tear down the old transmission, electric power transmission lines because that would leave you with insufficient capacity to reliably serve load in this region. You need to build parallel facilities. If this implies that perhaps we need a parallel corridor or simply a wider corridor, so be it. But we are faced currently with trying to make long range plans for the Puget Sound area. Unless we locate power generating facilities in this area, we will rely on transmission corridors such as the one designated on the maps in this room and posted on the website.

One element of the PEIS which did concern me having to do with the section on what is the purpose and need for designating westwide energy corridors, with respect to electric facilities, I think there was not enough emphasis on the age of existing facilities and the need to have additional corridor space to construct replacement facilities as those existing facilities age.

We're literally at a point where within decades those existing facilities may need to be taken out of service for a period of months or year and we need to have the replacement facilities in place before those facilities can be taken out of service or rebuilt.

Thank you very much for this opportunity to comment. We'll review the PEIS postings and make additional comments on your website. Thank you.

Darby Collins:

Is there anyone else who would like to comment at this time? So we will pause and—on the webcast—and if you all would like to ask further questions of the folks back there, we're available to discuss it as much as possible. We'll gear this back up if we have anyone else who'd like to make an additional comment or a new one. Thanks.

Patrick Goldsworthy:

I may make a couple of additional comments and that is for those of you who don't really know who I am or what I do, I'm a retired biochemistry professor from the University of Washington and all I do is free. I just donate my time and my efforts so I'm a non-profit contributor and our organization is a non-profit group so we're not in the business of energy, we're just trying to represent public interests.



daniel.walters@dnr.wa.gov
WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF
Natural Resources

Dan Walters
Property & Acquisition Specialist
Rights-of-Way Program
Product Sales & Leasing Division

1111 Washington St. SE
PO Box 47016
Olympia, WA 98504-7016
www.dnr.wa.gov

(360) 902-1646
Fax (360) 902-1789
dan.walters@wadnr.gov

**Energy Corridor Exhibit Map
State of Washington Lands**

-  Public Land Survey Sections
-  Public Land Survey Townships
-  Energy Corridor Centerline
-  Energy Corridor Area
-  State Trust Lands

1 inch equals 3,000 feet

connect the line

T26R12E

T25R12E

