



STATE OF WASHINGTON
ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL
PO Box 43172 • Olympia, Washington 98504-3172

November 23, 2005

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

SUBJECT: WEST-WIDE ENERGY CORRIDOR PROGRAMMATIC EIS

Dear Sir or Madam:

Please find enclosed the Washington State's comments regarding the West-wide Energy Corridor Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 360-956-2150 or email at: jiml@cted.wa.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jim Luce".

Jim Luce
EFSEC Chair

Enclosure: One



State of Washington
Comments on Section 368 of Energy Policy Act of 2005
Programmatic EIS
November 23, 2005

The State of Washington appreciates the opportunity to comment on the programmatic environment impact statement (EIS) being prepared in accordance with Section 368 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

Washington State concurs in the comments offered by the State of Oregon insofar as they are not specific to the State of Oregon, and in addition, offers the following comments.

One recommendation about which we feel very strongly is that the Department hold a series of public meetings to accept public comment on the draft EIS and explain progress that has been made on Section 1221.

This need is heightened by the key inter-relationships between Section 368 and Section 1221 of the Energy Policy Act and we recommend that the Department address the interrelationships and impacts, provide updates on Section 1221 "congestion studies," and advise the public of any potential applications it may have knowledge of for "national interest corridors." This information will allow our State and the public to have a more robust and complete understanding of the significant transmission issues presented by the Energy Policy Act.

At a minimum, the draft Section 368 EIS should discuss potential impacts on land air and water that may occur from the four alternatives presented. The analysis should not only focus on specific proposed or possible corridors, but also broader impacts of alternatives and the no action. Where would new power plants be built, where would industry develop and what would be the environmental, economic, and social impacts be to those locations.

Our understanding is that there is currently no specific or detailed information on existing corridors. We believe this information and a better understanding of what the Department believes constitutes a "corridor" is important to your development of the programmatic statement and to our ability to comment effectively on the EIS.

Once the specific information on existing corridors is known, the Department should carefully consider corridor compatibility issues; that is, to analyze whether usages within the corridors to be identified or added are not inconsistent. For example, there are pros and cons about siting multi-use facilities within a specific corridor. Gas and electricity, for example, may not always be compatible and can present safety issues. Homeland security is also important and a discussion regarding corridor identification and multiple uses within this context is appropriate.