

Corridor EIS Archives

From: corridoreiswebmaster@anl.gov
Sent: Friday, July 07, 2006 11:43 PM
To: corridoreisarchives,
Subject: Preliminary Draft Corridor Map Comment M0061

Attachments: final_comm_-_prelim_draft_map_-_6G_M0061.doc



inal_comm_-_prelim
_draft_map_...

Thank you for your comment, John Moore.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is M0061. Once the comment response document has been published, please refer to the comment tracking number to locate the response.

Comment Date: July 7, 2006 11:42:35PM CDT

Preliminary Draft Corridor Map Comment: M0061

First Name: John
Middle Initial: K
Last Name: Moore
Address: 5125 8th Avenue
City: Sacramento
State: CA
Zip: 95820
Country: USA
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record
Attachment: C:\aaj\conserv\Energy corridors_6\JKM docs\final comm - prelim draft map - 6G.doc

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at:
corridoreiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Preliminary Draft Corridor Map Webmaster at
(630)252-6182.

Comments on Preliminary Draft Map of Potential Energy Corridors

John K Moore

I am very pleased that most of the potential corridors are existing corridors or rights-of-way, as environmentalists have urged, and that the absurd corridors crossing protected areas proposed by stakeholders are not on the preliminary draft map. Use of existing corridors should tend to minimize additional adverse environmental effects. Observations of the environmental effects that have occurred in existing corridors should facilitate environmentally sensitive management of additional facilities in these corridors. Minimizing the number and extent of corridors will reduce the need for mitigation efforts.

The maps should indicate whether or not each potential corridor is an existing corridor. This information would be extremely useful to commenters, enabling them to assess the effects on areas in the vicinity of those existing corridors with which they are familiar.

Most if not all of the potential corridors across federal lands also cross non-federal lands. The maps should show the entire lengths of existing corridors and rights-of-way that are potential corridors, even though the corridor study and land management agencies do not have the power to designate corridors on non-federal land. Showing the entire lengths of these existing corridors and rights-of-way verifies that the existing potential corridors are part of a coordinated system. Concerns about the coordination of potential corridors on federal land and non-federal lands were stated repeatedly at the March California Energy Commission hearing in Sacramento

The individual maps for each state are a big improvement over the single map, but much larger scale maps will have to be provided in the draft EIS. A scale not much smaller than the 1" = 2 miles scale of National Forest visitor maps is needed. The maps must show the land survey grid so that they can be related to federal agency maps.

I question whether corridors as wide as 3500' are needed. The widths of corridors should be related to the numbers and types of facilities expected to be located within them.

Technical note: I appreciate your making it possible to submit comments as attachments, which makes composition of comments and saving copies of comments much easier.

Specific comments on potential corridors in California

There is a mysterious discontinuity in the corridor along US 395 between a point about 30 miles north of the Sierra County line and BLM lands north of the Sierra Army Depot. Perhaps this is an instance where showing the entirety of an existing corridor would provide important information. Corridors in this vicinity should avoid the Skedaddle Wilderness Study Area east of 395 and north of Honey Lake.

The Owens Valley corridor roughly parallel to US 395 should be located so that the renowned views of the Sierra Nevada to west and views of the Inyo Mountains to the east are not cluttered with powerlines, as would be the case if the powerlines were too close to 395. I do not recall

that the views are cluttered at present. Locations further from 395 may have other environmental problems of which I am not aware.

The corridor adjacent to I-5 in vicinity of Mount Shasta should be located so that views of the mountain are not adversely affected by powerlines.

The proposed Sunrise Powerlink powerline across Anza Borrego State Park would have many adverse environmental effects. A potential corridor for this line across BLM lands east of Anza Borrego should not be designated.