

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Corridor Designation  
EIS Scoping Process  
Public Meeting

Thursday, November 3, 2005  
2:00 p.m.

Hilton Garden Inn  
4000 North Central Avenue  
Phoenix, Arizona 85012

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

**driver** *and* **nix**  
COURT REPORTERS

COPY

Deborah L. Moreash, RPR  
Certified Court Reporter #50294

365 E. CORONADO ROAD, SUITE 150  
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85004  
(602) 266-6525  
FAX (602) 266-4303  
1-800-488-DEPO(3376)  
[www.drivernix.com](http://www.drivernix.com)

1 DR. PELL: That's great, and I am not going to  
2 go read this word, I'll spell it out because reading it may  
3 be too provocative, S-W-A-T Subregional Planning Group.  
4 Can you please tell us what that is? **AZ04**

5 MR. ROBERT KONDZIOLKA: Yes. Good afternoon,  
6 pleased to be here. My name is Robert Kondziolka. That is  
7 spelled K-O-N-D-Z-I-O-L-K-A. I hope that doesn't count  
8 against my five minutes. I'm here representing the Salt  
9 River Project, which is a water and power utility here in  
10 the Phoenix Valley. I'm also representing the Southwest  
11 Area Transmission Group. It is a subregional planning  
12 group for transmission. It covers the states of Arizona,  
13 New Mexico, west Texas, southern Nevada, and Imperial  
14 Valley of California. As the previous speakers, I would  
15 like to limit my comments this afternoon to a few key high  
16 little points and then plan to submit more detailed  
17 comments by the end of the month. And eight points I'd  
18 like to cover in my five minutes.

19 The first is to the issue of planning. In the  
20 regional, which is the western area connection basis and  
21 the subregional area, planning activity is very active. We  
22 have multiple groups focused and identifying the most  
23 viable projects that are out there. An important element  
24 to note is alternatives are studied in this planning  
25 process phase and these are studied before projects are

1 proposed.

2           So we encourage the DOE and BLM to work with  
3 the subregional planning groups and the Western Electricity  
4 Coordinating Council in its effort in identifying projects.  
5 WECC has a planning process, WECC has a regional planning  
6 process that provides notice and invites other parties to  
7 consolidate their needs into a singular or fewer projects.  
8 This is an effort to minimize impact and to maximize the  
9 value of new transmission projects that are proposed. This  
10 process also includes due process.

11           Jointly owned transmission. A significant  
12 amount of transmission in the west is jointly owned. This  
13 is done to reduce the risk of the project and to  
14 consolidate those needs. Most of these projects that have  
15 been announced, these major projects you have heard  
16 recently, will be jointly owned. We believe the DOE and  
17 BLM should provide consideration to those projects that are  
18 jointly sponsored and owned as demonstration of need,  
19 alternative evaluation, and the minimization of impacts.

20           We've heard a little bit about reliability so  
21 far this afternoon. We recommend that DOE evaluate and  
22 consider the balance between the public desire to  
23 consolidate facilities into common corridors against the  
24 risk of placing too many facilities in that same common  
25 corridor. I do plan to submit a report on the evaluation

of electric transmission and pipelines fairly detailed to help evaluate what that separation distance might be to address reliability and safety issues.

5           When evaluating facilities in a common corridor, we believe that it is important that we not take a look at just what has been used in the past as typical separation distances, but we take a look at what the loss of multiple facilities in a common corridor might be and what the impact of that loss and its consequences are.

10       I've already addressed separation of facilities and common corridors. We will address that in more detail in our  
11       comments.  
12

13           Global need identified by SWAT. SWAT has been  
14       and is evaluating long-term needs in the southwest, and not  
15       just what is needed in the next five to ten years. We  
16       encourage the DOE and BLM to have a long-term perspective  
17       in the evaluation of this process and to consider future  
18       needs. The SWAT studies have identified the need for  
19       additional transmission, I don't think that comes as a  
20       surprise. And our concern is if action is not taken during  
21       this process, the corridors needed to build that future  
22       transmission may not be available when it comes time to  
23       develop it.

24           Existing corridors. I heard some previous  
25       comments here so I won't belabor the point, but we do

1 encourage the DOE and BLM to look at trying to improve as  
2 many of the existing linear features that are on the  
3 federal lands as possible for consideration as energy  
4 corridors.

5 And then lastly, I've got kind of a cumulative  
6 thing here, this says connect action, cumulative impact,  
7 emissions, and EMF. We do request that DOE and BLM address  
8 these as global issues and not to leave them needlessly  
9 studied on each and every project as specific EA and EIS  
10 issues. The western interconnection is one large  
11 electrical grid and every project is tied to it and  
12 coordinates together.

13 We recognize the need for cultural and  
14 biological resources that are likely to be focussed on  
15 individual projects during an application. However, we do  
16 request that class three cultural resource surveys not be  
17 required during the permitting stage of a project. We  
18 recommend that class three cultural resource surveys not be  
19 required until the time period prior to construction for  
20 any type of earth-disturbing activities.

21 I thank you for your time, look-forward to  
22 future participation, and this concludes my remarks.

23 DR. PELL: Thank you ever so much, I appreciate  
24 that and hopefully we'll receive something in writing from  
25 you as a follow-up.

1 MR. ROBERT KONDZIOLKA: You will.

2 DR. PELL: I appreciate that. I will once  
3 again invite those of you standing in the back to please  
4 come forward, there are plenty of seats up here. I'd like  
5 to get a better look at you and let you get a better look  
6 at us. So make yourself comfortable if you would. We're  
7 all friends here, so let's not worry about creating a  
8 commotion by coming up front or anything like that.

9 I'd like to move on. Mr. William Kurtz,  
10 representing himself at this point. **AZ05**

11 MR. WILLIAM KURTZ: My name is William Kurtz,  
12 K-U-R-T-Z. I'm a resident of Santa Cruz County, Arizona.  
13 What I have witnessed over the last five years is a  
14 concerted systematic effort on the part of the  
15 Administration with the support of Congress to cut down,  
16 eviscerate, negate all of the good environmental progress  
17 of the last 20 to 40 years. The new corridors alternative  
18 in the PEIS before us today seems to me yet another way to  
19 reduce and get around present environmental laws and  
20 regulations.

21 Of the alternatives enumerated in the PEIS, I  
22 think the increased utilization alternative should be  
23 adopted and the new corridor alternative should be  
24 rejected. If additional corridors are ever needed, they  
25 should go through the presently existing procedures. As