

---

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING OF THE WEST-WIDE  
ENERGY CORRIDOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

OCTOBER 25, 2005, 2:00 P.M.

MEETING 1-A

---

HELD AT:

COLORADO CONVENTION CENTER

700 - 14TH STREET

DENVER, COLORADO

1           POWERS: Welcome everybody. Thanks for  
2 coming. I'd like to introduce Lynn Rust, he's the  
3 Deputy State Director here for the BLM in the  
4 Colorado State Office, and he'd like to welcome you  
5 to his town.

6           RUST: Welcome to the new Colorado  
7 Convention Center. It's turned into quite an  
8 edifice. With completion of the new addition,  
9 they've changed some of the entrances around a  
10 little bit and I was wandering around lost trying  
11 to figure out how to get in here. So, welcome to  
12 Colorado if you out-of-state, and certainly, a lot  
13 of members of the team are, welcome to the  
14 convention center.

15           I'm one of three deputies, but I'm the Deputy  
16 State Director for Energy, Land and Minerals for  
17 BLM- Colorado. So, the topic today is certainly of  
18 importance to the programs with which I administer  
19 for the BLM in Colorado.

20           It's my pleasure to welcome you to this first  
21 public scoping meeting for the West-wide Energy  
22 Corridor Environmental Impact Statement. This is  
23 required by the Energy Policy Act, which is the  
24 comprehensive energy bill passed by Congress,  
25 signed by the President on August 8th. It's

1 certainly one of the most far-reaching pieces of  
2 energy legislation the country really has ever  
3 seen. There is an awful lot that's being required  
4 of federal agencies and those of us who are  
5 involved in that are really scrambling quite a bit  
6 to start getting done everything that Congress and  
7 the administration wants done.

8         This particular joint effort involving five  
9 federal agencies and covering land in eleven  
10 states, will be going on for the next couple of  
11 years. There will be additional scoping meetings  
12 held throughout the west over the next few weeks.  
13 Again, this is the first one and I think -- what?  
14 there's eleven total? Is that correct? -- that  
15 will go on in various cities.

16         Please use this opportunity to give your  
17 comments and suggestions on this very important  
18 project. The agencies will use all comments  
19 collected during the scoping period, which ends on  
20 November 28th to formulate the draft Programmatic  
21 Environmental Impact Statement.

22         Once the draft is released, there will be an  
23 additional opportunity for public comment -- public  
24 review and comment on the various alternatives in  
25 the draft, and these comments will be incorporated

1 in the final Environmental Impact Statement and the  
2 Record of Decision. Comments will be accepted in a  
3 variety of forms, through your verbal and written  
4 testimony today, in written form through the mail,  
5 on the web and by fax.

6 I really can't stress the importance of energy  
7 corridors enough. This is a topic that I've been  
8 kind of sounding for a couple of years, now. You  
9 can explore and develop energy minerals all you  
10 want in particular areas, but if you can't get it  
11 to the markets, it doesn't do any good.  
12 Transportation, whether it's by pipeline, rail  
13 line, by wire moving electrons, is critical to the  
14 country's energy needs.

15 At this time, I'd like to introduce our panel  
16 members for today's meeting. Your moderator for  
17 today's meeting will be Scott Powers with the  
18 Bureau of Land Management. Julia Souder with the  
19 Department of Energy. She is the National Project  
20 Manager for the Environmental Impact Statement.  
21 And Paul Johnson with the Forest Service. All  
22 three work for the Washington office, which I do  
23 not. And so, Scott, please take it away. Thank  
24 you.

25 POWERS: Thank you, Lynn. Appreciate you

1 coming by. Nice to see a lot of familiar faces in  
2 the crowd -- people that I personally have been  
3 talking to about corridors for a number of years.  
4 I'm the BLM Project Manager for this project and  
5 we're co-leads with the Department of Energy and  
6 the Forest Service is a cooperating agency for the  
7 Programmatic EIS.

8 I just wanted to give a little bit more  
9 background, elaborate a little bit more on what  
10 Lynn said about the Energy Policy Act, although I  
11 assume most of the people in here understand what  
12 Section 3.68 directs us to do. It directs the  
13 Secretaries of Energy, Ag, Interior, Commerce and  
14 Defense to designate corridors for oil, gas and  
15 hydrogen pipelines and electricity transmission and  
16 distribution facilities on federal lands in eleven  
17 contiguous western states.

18 The Act further directs us to incorporate the  
19 designated corridors into the relevant agency  
20 land-use plans. And that's a key point that you  
21 need to keep in mind. The outcome of this project  
22 will ultimately result in the BLM and the Forest  
23 Service making resource allocation decisions  
24 through the land-use planning process.

25 So, for the purpose of complying with Section

1 3.68, the Department of Energy, the BLM and the  
2 Forest Service are preparing this West-Wide Energy  
3 Corridor Programmatic Environmental Impact  
4 Statement. And I won't say that anymore. That's a  
5 mouthful. But, we're going to do this jointly and  
6 we're going to try to accomplish it within the  
7 24-month time frame, as directed by the  
8 legislation. So, we're to have a final Record of  
9 Decision issued by each agency in the land- use  
10 plans amended by August 7th of 2007. And if  
11 anybody's ever worked on an large EIS, that's warp  
12 speed. So, we're going to be moving through this  
13 process as quickly as we can.

14 We really appreciate your interest in this  
15 project, and we really hope that you will help  
16 start to provide us the information we're going to  
17 need to build the alternative to be considered  
18 within this EIS. You know, scoping is the  
19 opportunity for the public to come in and tell us  
20 what they think should be considered in the EIS.  
21 You know, what the scope of the document should be.  
22 It helps us identify issues. And, as I said, most  
23 importantly, we're going to develop alternatives  
24 for this Programmatic EIS once scoping is complete.  
25 At this present time, we haven't started that

1 process.

2 Lynn mentioned how comments can be provided.  
3 There's a number of ways, and there's a poster  
4 board outside the door here that tells the four  
5 different ways. We have an active website already  
6 up and running that we think will answer most of  
7 that we can think of. And I encourage you to go to  
8 that website.

9 We're going to be providing a report that  
10 summarizes all the comments that were provided  
11 during scoping. We're hoping to get that out in  
12 January -- this-coming January.

13 We've asked people to sign up at the  
14 registration table if they want to speak this  
15 afternoon; some have and we assume that some in the  
16 audience haven't and may still want to speak. We're  
17 going to ask you to come up and give your name, who  
18 you represent, and we'll turn this podium a little  
19 bit so you can address comments to the panel.

20 We're here to listen to what you have to say today,  
21 and if there's some clarifying questions, we'll try  
22 to answer those, but more importantly, we want to  
23 hear what you have to say.

24 I hope everybody has turned off their  
25 cellphones or pagers. If you haven't, please do.

1 Again, when you come up -- I'll call your name, but  
2 if you would repeat your name for the recorder,  
3 that will help.

4 Did I leave anything out? Okay, with that --  
5 any questions before we get started? Okay. Well,  
6 I'm going to call on an old friend to come up  
7 first. Mr. Lowery? Rick Lowery with EEI.

8 We'd appreciate it if you'd try to keep your  
9 comments to about five minutes.

CO01

10 LOWERY: Thanks, Scott. I'm Rick Lowery  
11 with the Edison Electric Institute in Washington,  
12 D.C. The Edison Electric Institute, or EEI, thanks  
13 the federal agencies for the opportunity to make  
14 comments on the West-wide Energy Corridor  
15 Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement or, as  
16 I'll say from now on, PEIS, and that's hard enough  
17 to say.

18 EEI is the association of United States  
19 shareholder-owned electric companies. A number of  
20 EEI's member companies generate, transmit and  
21 deliver electricity in the contiguous eleven  
22 western states covered by the PEIS. EEI applauds  
23 the Departments of Energy, Agriculture and Interior  
24 in proceeding forward to identify endemic corridors  
25 for energy linear facilities across federal land in



1 the west. We also applaud the Western Utility  
2 Group, Western Governors Association, and other  
3 groups that have been addressing the need for  
4 energy corridors in the west.

5 Because of the predominance of federal land  
6 ownership in the west and the location of such  
7 lands, the federal land agencies must be a partner  
8 in helping meet the energy infrastructure needs for  
9 the west. At least six of the fastest growing  
10 states are located in the west.

11 The corridor initiative will provide, at least  
12 from the EEI perspective, a dual benefit. One, it  
13 will allow consideration of the infrastructure  
14 needs on a source-to-market basis. Something that  
15 is very important to EEI and it's member companies.  
16 And, two, it will allow for better or more careful  
17 planning to conserve and protect natural resource  
18 values on federal land while meeting these energy  
19 infrastructure needs.

20 EEI believes that the corridor designation  
21 process as proposed will enable the public to  
22 better appreciate and evaluate the basis for energy  
23 infrastructure decisions. The context of the  
24 decisions will be more readily apparent. EEI  
25 supports the legislative provisions that are the

1 basis of this corridor designation effort, Section  
2 3.68 of EPA, and we look forward to working with  
3 the agencies to fulfill Congressional intent.

4       EEI would like to offer the following six  
5 recommendations in the designation of western  
6 energy corridors.

7       First, consider a long-term planning horizon.  
8 Federal land-use planning horizons and utility  
9 horizons are not easily reconciled. We encourage  
10 the agencies to take a long view and anticipate  
11 what the transmission needs will be, and designate  
12 corridors accordingly. Utilities and other  
13 participants in the western regional transmission  
14 planning are very willing to assist the agencies.

15       Second, define now a future process for  
16 designating additional corridors, as needed,  
17 recognizing that it may be impossible to anticipate  
18 what those transmission needs will be ten, fifteen  
19 or even twenty years down the road. EEI strongly  
20 recommends the agencies develop now a process for  
21 designating additional source-to-market corridors  
22 once this process is complete. This may usefully  
23 include a [skip-over] process where the critical  
24 feature is to allow for an integrated,  
25 multi-jurisdictional evaluation and decision

1 regarding corridor designation.

2 Third, define now the stream-lined procedures  
3 available to electric companies abiding within a  
4 designated corridor. EEI strongly urges the  
5 agencies to develop sound and effective  
6 stream-lined procedures for siting facilities  
7 within a designated corridor. The procedures should  
8 recognize that much of the environmental analysis  
9 and review will have already taken place and, as  
10 long as facilities are consistent with the  
11 parameters set for a corridor, that work should not  
12 have to be repeated. At a minimum, we encourage  
13 you to establish a rebuttable presumption that will  
14 be a categorical provision for NEPA that will be  
15 consistent with Section 3.90 of EPAC for pipelines.

16 Transmission should not be treated differently  
17 than pipelines, in our opinion. EEI recommends the  
18 agencies to consider an alternative, streamlined  
19 consultation process under the Threatened and  
20 Endangered Species Act.

21 Fourth, flexibility should be a consideration  
22 of the process. This can be accomplished through  
23 careful consideration of what [garbled] set for  
24 corridors. This should be based on a technical and  
25 engineering requirement, and vegetation management

1 needs. But, also taking the decision to look at  
2 all existing rights- of-way containing 69KB and  
3 above transmission lines, and convert the corridors  
4 to expanded width and purposes.

5 This will allow either for the expansion of  
6 facilities within the corridor, or upgrading the  
7 facility to improve reliability in a band-grid  
8 capacity.

9 Fifth, protect corridors from incompatible  
10 uses. EEI urges the agencies to protect designated  
11 corridor against the entry of incompatible uses, or  
12 the location of incompatible uses near the  
13 facilities. In deciding what may or may not be an  
14 incompatible use, the agencies should consider how  
15 a transmission facility must be managed and  
16 operated to meet public safety and reliability  
17 requirements and concerns. And what will be needed  
18 to reduce fire hazard.

19 If the management requirements for another use  
20 conflict with the requirements for the transmission  
21 facilities, that other use should be clearly  
22 regarded incompatible.

23 [inaudible comment].

24 LOWERY: Okay. And sixth, carefully  
25 consider where and how public lands are disposed.

1 EEI recommends that land disposal or land swaps  
2 that would allow lands subject to a corridor  
3 designation to be transferred to private ownership  
4 generally be construed as an incompatible use.  
5 Should such a transfer be allowed, the transfer  
6 should be made subject to the designation, and with  
7 stipulations that protect the use of the land as a  
8 corridor, assure adequate management authority to  
9 meet reliability with respect to any facilities  
10 that might be located in a corridor, and does not  
11 allow the facility owner or operator to be charged  
12 rental fees different from those that would have  
13 been charged if the land had remained in federal  
14 possession.

15         Again, thank you for the opportunity to  
16 address you today. EEI believes through this  
17 process electric facilities operating in the west  
18 will be able to provide substantial assistance in  
19 identifying transmission needs throughout the  
20 region. EEI will submit written comments on or  
21 prior to the November 28th deadline specified in  
22 the Federal Register notice.

23         Thank you.

24                 POWER: Thank you, Rick. Ron Lehr with  
25 the American Wind Energy Association.

1           SOUDER: Just a reminder. If you'd like  
2 to [inaudible] now, you're more than free to do  
3 that, if you like.

CO02

4           LEHR: Afternoon. My name is Ron Lehr,  
5 L-E-H- R. I'm the western representative for the  
6 American Wind Energy Association.

7           I've provided the panel with a copy of a very  
8 preliminary outline of the concerns we'll want to  
9 raise in this process. And I'd like to go through  
10 and explain just briefly what we have in mind.

11           Wind energy will need transmission corridors  
12 that involve federal lands in the west, but the  
13 exact corridors and the precise timing are not  
14 available right now. We, the Wind Energy  
15 Association, and our colleagues at the West-Wind  
16 Wires, whom you will meet in Portland when you get  
17 there, want to help you identify the information  
18 that is available so that the corridors can be  
19 identified.

20           We want to add to these preliminary comments  
21 that I'm going to make today, as we get the chance  
22 to work on this some more with you and also some of  
23 the information that I'm going to tell you about  
24 has a chance to mature a little more.

25           The best information right now about wind

1 transmission needs is found in work by the various  
2 regional planning entities that do transmission  
3 planning in the region. And there will probably be  
4 some wind developers who will talk about particular  
5 projects. But, I will say that some of them also  
6 have confidentiality concerns about revealing where  
7 and the timing of the projects. So, I don't think  
8 the wind developers are going to be a complete  
9 source of information for this problem.

10 The draft wind report for the Western  
11 Governors Association's Clean and Diversified  
12 Energy Analysis Committee -- so-called CDEAC -- has  
13 the best information about the role of wind in the  
14 west, about making better use of existing  
15 transmission, which seems to me to be a  
16 prerequisite to adding, and the needs for new  
17 transmission corridors.

18 We've given you some information here about  
19 the projected demand for wind. We think it could  
20 play a very large role going forward in the  
21 electric sector, particularly as the fossil  
22 industry shows that it's unable to deliver stable  
23 prices to customers.

24 We've also cited the utility wind interest  
25 group, which is doing the best group of integration

1 of wind in the electric systems. That's something  
2 you need to understand that the costs of  
3 integrating this variable resource into the  
4 electric system are fairly modest. Not a  
5 show-stopper.

6 The markets that the wind projects in the west  
7 will serve -- I've characterized them as being  
8 local loads served on distribution levels by  
9 distributed community and locally-owned wind  
10 projects. I think this is really going to take  
11 off. It's taking off in the upper Midwest.  
12 Serving the regional population centers --  
13 something that the Rocky Mountain Transmission  
14 Study identified -- with lines that will come out  
15 of the wind areas and serve what's the most  
16 urbanized part of the country. The west is the  
17 most urbanized part of the country. More people  
18 living here in SMSAs [phonetic] than any place else  
19 in the country.

20 And then, the third market is the west coast,  
21 where the loads are, and that will require  
22 large-scale lines for export. It's a longer-term  
23 phenomenon, in my opinion. It depends on some  
24 changes in the transmission grid in operations,  
25 which I'll refer to, later.



1           But, there will be competition and trade-offs  
2 among these three niches. If it's too expensive  
3 and troublesome to build in the Wyoming wind  
4 resource -- which is the best one in North America  
5 -- and ship to California, then local California  
6 winds of less energetic kinds will be developed,  
7 instead. So there's going to be some trade-off  
8 among those different markets.

9           So, we have to keep an eye on that in the  
10 scoping for this process, because that will  
11 determine how much and what kind of corridors will  
12 needs.

13           The wind resources to be served are enormous  
14 in the west. They've been characterized by the  
15 National Renewal Energy Lab in a Renewable Energy  
16 Atlas in the west; in some scenarios that the Segue  
17 [phonetic] Group has put together in a balanced  
18 energy plan; and I've given you the websites for  
19 all of those.

20           There's a chicken-and-egg or timing mismatch  
21 problems that go along with wind. Wind resources  
22 are so large and so well distributed that the wind  
23 developers will go wherever the transmission is.  
24 So, when I talk to them, they say, "tell me where  
25 the transmission's going to be -- we'll build you

1 some wind right there".

2 And, wind can be developed in a couple of  
3 years. You have to wait around, but can be  
4 mobilized quite quickly. Transmission takes a long  
5 time. And, I think we'll see in the west states  
6 following the lead of Texas and Minnesota in  
7 getting state laws that require identification of  
8 those resources and transmission needed to serve  
9 them. And, I think that'll start to happen in the  
10 time frame for this study. So, you'll start to see  
11 that development coming up while you're looking at  
12 this.

13 There's some wildlife issues with wind. The  
14 National Wind Coordinating Committee has the best  
15 information on that, and I've given you a reference  
16 to them.

17 And, back on the transmission policy framework  
18 -- that's in transition -- so, how that transition  
19 operates between where we are in the market today  
20 with bilateral operations among utilities, in a  
21 transition towards a more open market for the west  
22 for resources like wind to move power around --  
23 that transition is going to really, I think, have a  
24 big impact on where the transmission corridors need  
25 to be. So, that's something I wanted to flag for

1 you, because I think it's going to be important.

2 One final point is that there's some work  
3 underway in Minnesota about compensating private  
4 land owners. I think it will be a rare situation  
5 where a transmission line will be located all in  
6 federal right-of-way. So, the feasibility of a  
7 federal right-of-way may turn on how acceptable a  
8 right-of-way is to private land owners. The  
9 methods that we have of compensating private land  
10 owners are, in my opinion, crude. And more  
11 sophisticated methods are under study now in  
12 Minnesota and may reflect more willingness by  
13 private owners to accept transmission. If that  
14 happens, then it could have impact on federal  
15 corridors, as well.

16 So, those are preliminary things that we  
17 wanted to identify. We'll keep working. We want  
18 to work with you to perfect some of these and,  
19 probably add some more. I know there's a couple  
20 that I thought about that didn't get into this, and  
21 we'll be putting them into the other cities where  
22 you're visiting, and some written comments.

23 Thanks, very much.

24 POWER: Thank you, Ron. Evan Hanson with  
25 Williams.

1           HANSON: My name is Evan Hanson. I'm  
2 with the Williams Companies, and we, too,  
3 appreciate the opportunity of expressing our  
4 opinion and writing our thoughts today.

5           The Williams Companies is primarily a natural  
6 gas company. We operate in the western United  
7 States 7,000 miles of transmission lines -- or,  
8 4,000 miles of transmission lines -- 7,000 miles of  
9 gathering and processing lines. And we have  
10 approximately 7,000 natural gas-producing wells.

11          We have facilities throughout the west, which  
12 use pipelines to conduct our business. And our  
13 transmission line to the northwest pipeline system  
14 is a primary source of natural gas in the states of  
15 Washington, Oregon and Idaho. We service natural  
16 gas from New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, as well as  
17 Canada.

18          Williams is smaller than we used to be. Five  
19 years ago, we had over 65,000 miles of natural gas  
20 transmission lines and 26,000 miles of fiberoptic  
21 cables that we've put in the ground. Since 1969,  
22 when NINFA [phonetic] was put in service, we've had  
23 tremendous experience putting pipeline and  
24 fiberoptic cable in the ground, and we think we  
25 understand the process.

1 Overall, we support the concept of creating  
2 the corridors. However, there are some concerns  
3 that we want to express and make sure they are  
4 addressed in this process.

5 We are currently conducting a process to build  
6 a new system from Wyoming to Kansas, and in certain  
7 areas of this system, we find that we'll be  
8 following a pipeline corridor where there are ten  
9 existing either pipelines or fiberoptic systems.  
10 However, we will be required to once again do the  
11 appropriate cultural and biological surveys. We  
12 feel certain circumstances of that nature are  
13 excepted and we hope that something can be done to  
14 address that.

15 We feel that Programmatic EIS, especially as  
16 broadly and regionally as this one is, would not do  
17 away with these investigations, but they should be  
18 done in the appropriate level. We are in the loop  
19 in this process. We do a lot of these facilities.

20 At the same time that this is being done, we  
21 think that there should be corridors built and  
22 represent the needs of the industry. For example,  
23 we need to exercise caution that when pipelines and  
24 power lines are put in the same corridors, that  
25 appropriate safeguards are in place that the

1 [garbled] protection of pipelines are not  
2 interfered with.

3 We think it is appropriate to have  
4 circumstances where construction has adequate room,  
5 where you can be putting multiple systems that we  
6 can operate without interfering with any of the  
7 existing facilities or the new facilities to come.  
8 We don't want to be locked into these corridors.

9 Any of these comments that you'll hear now,  
10 I'm sure that mine are duplicate -- some you've  
11 heard and some you'll hear throughout the rest of  
12 the day -- but we feel this is very important. We  
13 want to be able to have flexibility to fulfill that  
14 potential if new energy sources are developed,  
15 you've got to have new corridors to address those  
16 and get those to the market.

17 We want to make sure that there are sufficient  
18 locations that are remote from these that can  
19 protect the assets that will be put in place,  
20 meaning the platforms, power lines and such, that  
21 get those to the appropriate market. We fell that  
22 there's great disparity in the marketplace right  
23 now, and a lot of this is due to the lack of  
24 infrastructure.

25 This will become more and more important as

1 access for developed energy sources here in the  
2 Rocky Mountain states in particular. There are  
3 projects that I'm sure you are aware of going from  
4 the Rocky Mountains to the eastern corridors. These  
5 need to have good access through both public and  
6 private grounds. We feel that the need to balance  
7 private and public grounds needs to be addressed as  
8 part of this process. That where we are traversing  
9 both, that no one is damaged and that people are  
10 allowed so they can get just compensation for the  
11 land used.

12 Williams will be providing written comments to  
13 you formally, before the deadline. We commend you  
14 for this efforts. We are looking forward to the  
15 opportunity of providing these comments and would  
16 be glad to consult in any way that we could as we  
17 go forward.

18 Thank you.

**CO04**

19 POWERS: [inaudible]. Sandra Johnson  
20 from Xcel Energy.

21 P.JOHNSON: [inaudible].

22 POWERS: Turn it up a little be more. I  
23 guess we'll ask the speakers to get a little closer  
24 to it.

25 P.JOHNSON: [inaudible]. Sure. Thank

1 you. I'm Sandra Johnson. I work for Xcel Energy.  
2 Xcel Energy has facilities in multiple states and  
3 we're here today to speak on behalf of Public  
4 Service Company of Colorado.

5 The demand for electricity continues to grow  
6 at a very health pace in Colorado. And while we  
7 are actively seeking the addition of generation  
8 resources within our state to meet our load, we  
9 also rely on the existing corridors that bring  
10 power into our state from both the north and west,  
11 as well as the southwest.

12 So, what we are hoping to accomplish through  
13 this is the identification of those existing  
14 corridors for expansion potential, as well as the  
15 identification of new corridors.

16 We are transmission constrained, as I  
17 mentioned, and we anticipate that in order to  
18 continue to provide low-cost power to our  
19 customers, in addition to building generation  
20 within our state purchasing it from third parties,  
21 we will also need to rely on generation resources  
22 outside of our state, whether it be renewable  
23 and/or coal. And, so, we want to preserve, I  
24 guess, our rights and opportunities to work with  
25 the DOE on the development of these corridors going



1 forward so that we can participate and actively  
2 comment [garbled].

3 POWERS: [inaudible]. Is Pam Inman here?  
4 Okay. Landon Gates from Colorado Farm Bureau? No?  
5 Well, we'll have our open mike for those that  
6 didn't sign up, if they'd like to come up and say  
7 something. Those are the only people that  
8 pre-registered to speak, so, if there's anybody  
9 else? Okay.

10 [inaudible].

11 POWERS: Huh?

12 [inaudible].

13 POWERS: [inaudible].

CO05

14 MURRAY: My name is Mark Murray and I'm  
15 with Tri-State Generation and Transmission  
16 Association located here in Denver. We are a  
17 generation and transmission cooperative. We serve  
18 44 member electric distribution cooperative  
19 throughout a four-state area of western Nebraska,  
20 Wyoming, Colorado and New Mexico.

21 As pointed out by Sandra with Xcel, Tri-State,  
22 too, is experiencing a great deal of load growth in  
23 our members on the front range, western slopes and  
24 throughout the western grid. We would encourage  
25 and support the Programmatic EIS that's taking

1 place. We would also encourage that you would seek  
2 information from the western electric -- WECC --  
3 and a conduit for that could be the Western Utility  
4 Group. Tri-State is an active member in that group  
5 and we provide information to WECC on our  
6 expansions as needed for our electric grid system.

7 And that's the only comments I have. Thank  
8 you.

9 POWERS: Thank you, Mark. Is there  
10 anybody else that would like to come up and say  
11 anything? Okay. I want to remind you that we have  
12 the scoping comment form on the registration table.  
13 There's copies of the Notice of Intent to prepare  
14 the Programmatic EIS on the back table.

15 There's several other -- since this is our  
16 first coping session meeting and we're going to do  
17 this in eleven states in the next eight or nine  
18 days, we've actually got two teams that are going  
19 to be doing this and we all came here to the first  
20 one so that, you know, we could get a sense for  
21 what kind of a response we'd get and so we could  
22 figure out whether we're going to do some of these  
23 things together, as well.

24 And, I'd like to ask those members of BLM,  
25 Forest Service and DOE to stand up, because we're

1 going to be around. We'll be available to answer  
2 questions and --. Okay. Thank you, very much.

3 MALE: [inaudible].

4 POWERS: Yes, sir. There's another  
5 session from 7:00 to 9:00 right here tonight. Yeah,  
6 Ron?

7 LEHR: [inaudible].

8 POWERS: Well, what I've been advising  
9 people is, well, from the industry's perspective  
10 that is going to have a utility -- some time of  
11 linear utility facility -- we need to know where  
12 you need to get from point A to point B and why is  
13 that important to you. I mean, it's basically that  
14 simple. And, so -- we could try to make it more  
15 complicated that that's going to be the gist of the  
16 information, from my perspective. Paul or Julia?  
17 Would you like to add --

18 SOUDER: I just like to add that  
19 expressing your priorities of why you agree or  
20 disagree, whether there's things you really want  
21 brought to the surface and that you really want to  
22 educate us on. Because, the main point of the  
23 public scoping meeting is to really hear from you  
24 many perspectives -- not just industry but, I mean,  
25 all the different voices that are out there to make

1 sure that we can consider these comments and really  
2 listen to them so that when we're writing the  
3 report, we've definitely heard from everybody  
4 [inaudible].

5 And it is the best way with these formats is  
6 to really express your priorities -- to really show  
7 us up- front this is what is most important to us,  
8 and as Scott said, this is why.

9 P.JOHNSON: And, also, just to add, the  
10 collection of information that we will have at  
11 these meetings will go to help the writers of the  
12 Programmatic EIS in framing the alternatives, and  
13 so forth. So, it's good to give us your comments  
14 and suggestion, so that as we move forward in  
15 developing the Programmatic EIS, we have all the  
16 available information to move forward in this  
17 endeavor.

18 SOUDER: Whether comments are submitted  
19 via at the annual public scoping meetings, website  
20 or fax, they are treated equally. There's equal  
21 weight granted to each one. There's no ranking  
22 [inaudible]. We're glad to get public scoping  
23 comments. The website again, which is on the  
24 poster and the Notice of Intent, and on various  
25 documents that were handed out is

1 <http://corridoreis.anl.gov>.

2 POWERS: Another question?

3 FAY: Are you -- do you have cooperating  
4 agencies that are already signed up [inaudible]  
5 regional [inaudible].

6 SOUDER: We're in consultation with  
7 various groups, but, as of right now, BLM, Forest  
8 Service and DOE, that are the agencies right now.  
9 After public scoping, we'll be definitely adding  
10 more names to that [inaudible].

11 FAY: [inaudible].

12 SOUDER: Right. We'll definitely add to  
13 the various groups that make comments [inaudible].

14 SCHAFISH: Since we're asking questions  
15 -- at the end of these transmission corridors, at  
16 least the electric ones, there's some type of  
17 generation -- does that exclude some consideration  
18 [inaudible] process?

19 SOUDER: I don't think we have the answer  
20 to that, yet, because the whole point of public  
21 scoping is to get a better understanding --

22 SCHAFISH: Better understanding. So  
23 there could be included in the process of  
24 evaluation if you get enough comments --

25 SOUDER: Could be.

1           SCHAFISH: -- in the scoping process  
2     [inaudible].

3           VARHOL: Well, definitely you want the  
4     coal fields, the oil field and the wind areas  
5     [inaudible].

6           SOUDER: Would you want to make a public  
7     comment with your name and address? I mean, that'd  
8     be great.

CO06

9           VARHOL: Okay. My name is Thomas Varhol,  
10    I'm with Black & Beach [phonetic] Corporation.

11           POWERS: [inaudible].

12           VARHOL: Sure.

13           SOUDER: Thank you.

14           VARHOL: I have more questions than  
15    comments, but, I guess -- depending on how you  
16    respond to the questions -- what clearly -- with  
17    corridors in the western states, you want to hit  
18    coal fields and the oil shale area and the prime  
19    wind areas that the gentleman earlier spoke of. How  
20    wide are these corridors going to be? Any thoughts  
21    on that, yet?

22           POWERS: No. We're directing the  
23    legislation to establish a width, but that's going  
24    to be based on information that we receive in  
25    scoping.

1           VARHOL: But, are we talking about a line  
2 on a map, or are we talking about something several  
3 hundred feet wide or several miles wide?

4           SOUDER: That's all depending on what we  
5 receive from the public scoping.

6           POWERS: The legislation says we have to  
7 define a centerline of the corridor.

8           SOUDER: Right. I'm going to interrupt  
9 for one second, because we're not really supposed  
10 to be doing Q&A. We need to just check with you on  
11 public scoping and, if you want to continue this  
12 dialog with the panel, we'll be going off the  
13 record, so, I want to make sure that the people who  
14 still want to speak and be on the record, then  
15 let's do that now and we can do a Q&A off the  
16 record.

17           VARHOL: Okay. One last comment, then.  
18 I hope that you work with the state agencies that  
19 certify the various types of linear facilities and  
20 get their buy-in to whatever corridors you're  
21 talking about. Because, not only do we have to deal  
22 with federal agencies to permit various linear  
23 facilities, we also have to go through the state  
24 certification process. And we need their support on  
25 this, as well.

1           Thanks.

2           SOUDER: Does anyone else want to come to  
3 the podium and give their name and a comment?

4           [inaudible comments].

5           POWERS: Okay. Thank you, very much. I  
6 guess we can turn that up and open it up for  
7 questions.

8           [Break taken from 2:40 p.m. to 3:50 p.m.]

9           POWERS: Can I have your attention,  
10 please? Sorry about that. There's been several  
11 people that have signed up after we ended the  
12 official proceeding and so, I wanted to know if any  
13 of those people wanted to make any comments that  
14 they'd like to have recorded and whether we need to  
15 open the proceedings. So, is there anybody that  
16 wishes to do so? Okay. Thanks.

17                           [END OF MEETING]

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



1 STATE OF COLORADO )  
2 ) ss. CERTIFICATE  
3 COUNTY OF DENVER )

4 I, William W. Pace, Notary Public within  
5 and for the State of Colorado, do hereby certify:

6 That the foregoing proceedings were  
7 transcribed from a digital recording and  
8 thereafter reduced to typewritten form under my  
9 supervision, and that the same is, to the best of  
10 my ability, a true and correct transcription of  
11 the proceedings as I was able to hear them on the  
12 digital recording made available to me for  
13 re-recording transcription;

14 That I am not related to or in any way  
15 associated with any of the parties to said cause  
16 of action, or their counsel, and that I am not  
17 interested in the event thereof.

18 In witness whereof, I have affixed my  
19 signature and seal this 7th day of November, 2005.

20  
21  
22 My commission expires April 28, 2008.



23  
24 \_\_\_\_\_  
William W. Pace, Digital Reporter

