

From: [Susan Sack](#)
To: [Congestion Study Comments](#)
Subject: comment regarding transmission corridors
Date: Saturday, September 20, 2014 3:48:24 PM

I oppose energy corridors for several reasons.

Technology is progressing quickly and overhead transmission lines create hazards for citizens and take valuable irreplaceable farmable land out production. The cost to land owners through devaluation of property is huge and impedes on land owner rights. Long haul transmission is a knee jerk speculative reaction not a long term solution.

I encourage localized generation and subsidies for individuals and communities wishing to implement clean /renewable energy sources of electricity. In the past 30 year of Federal Wind Subsidies we have learned large scale wind farms are not sustainable. It is time to look at California's model for fulfilling their renewable energy portfolio. I hope to see a future where the existing power companies are storage and supplemental sources that manage a grid based on localized generation.

Energy corridors would be attractive to terrorists. I cannot imagine the devastation incurred if a terrorist attack targeted a corridor. Localized generation makes it much more difficult to create major energy disruption potentially affecting huge areas.

Off shore wind, tidal energy, wave energy, and solar energy produced near where it is needed makes a lot more sense than long haul transmission. I also encourage a second look at nuclear energy as a source using the newer albeit more expensive process which produces less radioactive waste.

Energy corridors are a band aid solution. Looking toward the future creatively and without the pressure from big business wanting to protect their personal interest is the challenge. Please focus on what is best for the citizens.

Respectfully Submitted,
Susan Sack 3799 E. 7th RD Mendota, IL