Mission Statement
The BLM’s multiple-use mission is to sustain the health and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations. The Bureau accomplishes this by managing such activities as outdoor recreation, livestock grazing, mineral development, and energy production, and by conserving natural, historical, cultural, and other resources on public lands.

Mission Statement
Western is a Federal agency under the Department of Energy that markets and transmits wholesale electrical power through an integrated 17,000-circuit mile, high-voltage transmission system across 15 western states. Western’s mission: Market and deliver clean, renewable, reliable, cost-based Federal hydroelectric power and related services.
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1.0 Introduction

Two primary principles of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) are full disclosure of potential environmental effects and open public participation throughout the decision-making process. The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and Western Area Power Administration (Western) are preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed TransWest Express Transmission Project (TWE Project). The BLM and Western are joint-lead agencies responsible for the preparation of the EIS. This Scoping Summary Report provides an overview of the public scoping process and a summary of the scoping comments, issues, and concerns identified during public scoping.

1.1 Joint Lead Agencies’ Purpose and Need

Bureau of Land Management’s Purpose and Need

The BLM is responding to a request from TransWest Express, LLC (TWE), to obtain a right-of-way (ROW) for the use of public lands to construct and operate an extra-high voltage transmission line. The BLM will prepare an EIS in conformance with NEPA. The purpose of the EIS is for the BLM to evaluate and disclose potential impacts of the proposed project and alternatives; to determine whether to issue a ROW Grant; and to amend BLM Resource Management Plans (RMPs) as needed.

The BLM is required to evaluate and make decisions regarding the granting of ROWs in response to proponent applications. Under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, Title V and the Energy Policy Act of 2005 BLM is authorized to issue ROW grants. It is the policy of the BLM to authorize all ROW applications that are in conformance with approved land use plans at the discretion of the authorized officer.

Western Area Power Administration’s Purpose and Need

Under Section 402 of the Recovery Act, Western may borrow funds from the United States (U.S.) Treasury to construct, finance, facilitate, plan, operate, maintain, and/or study construction of new or upgraded electric power transmission lines and related facilities. Prior to committing funds, Western must certify that the project is in the public interest; will not adversely impact system reliability or operations, or other statutory obligations; and it is reasonable to expect that the proceeds from the project shall be adequate to make repayment of the loan.

On March 4, 2009 Western solicited interest in proposed transmission projects that resulted in the submission of Statements of Interest including one for the TWE Project.

Western needs to decide whether to participate in the TWE Project as a joint owner with TWE as part of Western’s Transmission Infrastructure Program (TIP) and consistent with its Recovery Act authority. For Western to participate, Western needs the TWE Project to satisfy the requirements of Western’s TIP and its Recovery Act authority.

1.2 Description of the TWE Project

TWE and Western are proposing to construct, own, and operate the TWE Project, which would be an extra-high voltage (EHV), direct current (DC) transmission system extending from south-central Wyoming to southern Nevada. The TWE Project is intended to provide the transmission infrastructure and capacity necessary to deliver approximately 3,000 megawatts of electric power from renewable energy resources in south-central Wyoming to markets in the Desert Southwest region. The TWE Project would consist of an approximately 725-mile-long, 600-kilovolt, DC transmission line and two Alternating Current (AC)/DC converter stations – a Northern AC/DC Converter Station to be located near Sinclair, Wyoming, and a Southern AC/DC Converter Station to be located near the Marketplace Hub in the Eldorado Valley, approximately 25 miles south of Las Vegas, Nevada. TWE also is retaining an option
for a future interconnection with the Intermountain Power Project (IPP) transmission system in Millard County, Utah.

1.3 TWE Project Background

In 2005, Arizona Public Service Company (APS) announced plans to explore the feasibility of the TWE Project to meet its customers’ long-term growth needs. The TWE Project, as originally conceived, was to transport fossil fuel and renewable wind energy from Wyoming to utilities in Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, Nevada, and Utah. In addition to providing access to energy resources for rapid growth areas in the Southwest, the TWE Project was intended to benefit all western states by providing improved reliability of the western electrical grid. In March 2006, APS signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Wyoming Infrastructure Authority (WIA) and National Grid (an international electricity and gas company) to collaborate on a transmission corridor study. In December 2006, APS completed a feasibility report that concluded that the TWE Project potentially would create significant benefits for its customers.

During the same timeframe, Rocky Mountain Power (a subsidiary of PacifiCorp) was investigating the feasibility of developing the Gateway South Transmission Project (later to become known as the Energy Gateway South Project [EGS Project]), a proposed transmission line from eastern Wyoming into Utah, terminating at the Crystal Substation in Nevada. The EGS Project shared many corridor location aspects with the TWE Project.

In August of 2007, National Grid, APS, Rocky Mountain Power, and the WIA entered into an interim agreement (IA) to plan for development of new EHV transmission lines for the western U.S. These proponents’ system studies concluded that there was a demonstrated need to transmit electrical power from Wyoming to energy demand areas in Utah, Nevada, Arizona, and Southern California. Because both APS and Rocky Mountain Power had sponsored previous feasibility studies, those previous studies were incorporated into the collaborative effort to identify feasible transmission corridors developed under the IA.

The collaborative study area originally encompassed much of Wyoming, northwestern Colorado, southeastern Idaho, much of Utah, far eastern Nevada, and central Arizona. The analysis that resulted from the IA collaboration between National Grid, APS, Rocky Mountain Power, and WIA identified a preliminary set of EHV transmission corridors within which construction and operation of these facilities were considered to be environmentally feasible.

The APS interests in the TWE Project were acquired by National Grid, which filed a Standard Form 299 (SF 299) Application for Transportation and Utility Systems and Facilities on Federal Lands (Right-of-Way Grant application [ROW application]) with the BLM on November 30, 2007. In 2008, The Anschutz Corporation (TAC) formed TransWest Express, LLC (TWE – a wholly owned subsidiary of TAC), and acquired the TWE Project from National Grid. Subsequently, on September 2, 2008, National Grid and TWE submitted an amended ROW application requesting the assignment of the unserialized application and related project file to BLM. TWE submitted an amended ROW application for the TWE Project in December 2008, and another amended ROW application in January 2010.

Following the December 2008 ROW application, TWE and the BLM conducted a number of pre-scoping activities that identified several resource issues and land management concerns. These activities are summarized below:

- Pre-scoping meetings with the BLM field offices (FOs) and national forests located within the TWE Project area during February and March 2009.
Pre-scoping meeting with military representatives from Hill Air Force Base, Utah Test and Training.

Pre-scoping meeting with military representatives from Nellis Air Force Base.

In January 2010, TWE submitted another amended ROW application. The primary difference between the amended 2008 ROW application and the TWE’s amended 2010 ROW application is TWE’s stated need to allow for future interconnection with the IPP transmission system near Delta, Utah. In its January 2010 ROW application, TWE “identified a need to provide flexibility and maximize the use of transmission capacity that may become available by configuring the TWE Project to allow for future interconnections with other existing and planned electrical systems that can deliver electric energy from Wyoming to markets in the Desert Southwest region. This need is met by providing for a potential interconnection with the IPP transmission system near Delta in Millard County, Utah, as well as to the Marketplace Hub near Boulder City, Nevada.” The 2010 ROW application also moved the TWE Project origination point farther south and west to the Sinclair, Wyoming, area. However, the Aeolus Substation would be an alternative origination point. Additionally, based on agency pre-scoping input, other corridors or segments were added, deleted, and/or modified to meet the revised project interests and objectives. These pre-scoping activities are further discussed in Section 2.1.

Following TWE’s submittal of the amended January 2010 ROW application, TWE and Western entered into a non-binding term sheet through which they are evaluating each holding a 50 percent joint ownership in the TWE Project. TWE and Western are developing the terms of their joint ownership, such as construction, operation, and maintenance of the project. Under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, Western was granted authority to borrow funds from the U.S. Treasury to (among other things) plan, finance, and construct new or upgraded transmission facilities that deliver renewable energy. Western would use this authority for its participation on the project. The BLM and Western are serving as joint-lead agencies in preparing the TWE Project EIS.

This scoping summary report describes the pre-scoping and scoping process following TWE’s amended 2010 ROW application submission and the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) in the Federal Register on January 4, 2011. Figure 1-1 shows TWE’s proposed transmission line corridor and the alternative corridors identified by BLM and Western that were presented to the public during the scoping process.

1.4 Purpose of Scoping

Scoping is the process of actively soliciting input from the public and other interested federal, state, tribal, and local agencies. Information gained during scoping assists the BLM and Western in identifying potential environmental issues, alternatives, and mitigation measures associated with developing the proposed TWE Project. The process provides a mechanism for determining the scope and the significant issues associated with the TWE Project (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1507.7 and 40 CFR 1508.25) so the EIS can focus the analyses on areas of interest and concern. Therefore, public participation during the scoping period is a vital component to preparing a comprehensive and sound NEPA document. Scoping provides the public, tribes, and agencies opportunities for meaningful public involvement in the decision-making process.

BLM and Western’s overall scoping goal for the TWE Project is to engage a diverse group of public and agency participants in the NEPA process, solicit relevant input, and provide timely information throughout the duration of the project. Four specific goals were established in the TransWest Express Transmission Project Public Involvement Plan, March 5, 2010, and are provided below:
1. Provide accurate and timely information to the public;
2. Provide ample opportunities for the public to be involved in order to achieve supportable decisions;
3. Promote multi-level agency and multi-jurisdictional participation; and
4. Integrate technical information and science into the public involvement program to produce supportable management decisions that protect resource values.
The Project Corridor is the area where the Project transmission line right-of-way could be routed. This area varies in width due to topography and administrative boundaries, but generally is based on a 2-mile width.
2.0 Summary of the Scoping Process

2.1 Pre-scoping Activities

The BLM and Western conducted pre-scoping activities following the January 2010 SF 299 submittal. During the spring of 2010, comments were received from the interdisciplinary team, BLM FOs, Forest Service, and the Cooperating Agencies. These comments were considered in developing the alternative corridors presented to the public during the scoping period. Key concerns and issues received prior to publication of the NOI for the EIS include:

- Suggestions to avoid the South Unit of the Ashley National Forest and the Nine Mile Canyon cultural resource area (Utah).
- Duchesne County prefers the proposed corridor parallel existing major utility lines in their county (Utah).
- BLM Cedar City FO commented on why the southern Utah corridor (segment C260) did not follow the West-Wide Energy Corridor (Utah).
- BLM Vernal FO supports the elimination of Segment U400A because there are habitat areas of concern along that corridor segment (Utah).
- BLM Fillmore FO noted that there is a Congressional moratorium on amending their planning documents (House Range and Warm Springs RMPs). The existing corridor route along Interstate 15 (I-15) is an underground-only corridor (segments U125, U190, U195, U235 in the Fillmore FO) and would require a plan amendment to construct an above-ground transmission line. As such, the BLM Fillmore FO would support eliminating segments U125 and U195 (Utah).
- BLM Fillmore FO commented that there are many cultural resources near the Intermountain Power Line as well as a 90-mile transmission line associated with a wind energy development project north of Milford (Utah).
- The proposed corridor would conflict with the Ag 20 Zone of the Millard County Plan (Utah).
- BLM White River Office prefers that the proposed and alternative corridors be sited within existing utility corridors (Colorado).
- Commenter suggests avoiding Baggs, Wyoming, and prefers the far eastern corridor (Colorado/Wyoming).
- Alternatives surrounding Baggs could interfere with existing irrigated pasture lands (Wyoming).
- Alternatives crossing the Little Snake River could conflict with deed lands; therefore, suggestions were submitted regarding an alternative near Baggs, Wyoming (Wyoming).
- Concerns expressed about the TWE Project’s approach to conflicts with sage-grouse (Colorado).
- The BLM Nevada State Office noted that the Las Vegas area is very congested and there is a proposal to expand the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) lands north of Las Vegas (Nevada).

2.2 Notification

The initial step in the NEPA process is to notify the public, other government agencies, and tribes of the lead agency’s intent to prepare an EIS by publishing the NOI in the Federal Register. The NOI for the TWE Project was published in the Federal Register on January 4, 2011 (see Appendix B). Additionally, a TWE Project newsletter was mailed to approximately 23,000 interested parties including federal, state, and local agencies, and tribes as well as potentially affected landowners within the proposed 2-mile-wide
corridors for the proposed and alternative routes. The newsletters provided a description about the proposed TWE Project and alternatives, information about the NEPA scoping process, contact information, and scoping meeting dates, times, and locations.

BLM and Western placed display advertisements in local newspapers and Public Service Announcements (PSAs) were submitted for broadcast on local radio and television announcing the public meetings. A Media Plan was prepared to identify the appropriate media outlets for notifying the public in each individual geographic area. As part of the Media Plan, BLM Public Affairs personnel from each of the BLM FOs were contacted to identify the appropriate media outlets and optimum time for conducting a public meeting in their area. The information was compiled and used to schedule the public scoping meetings and media placement for notification. Table 2-1 provides a summary of media accessed for notification of the public scoping meetings. A copy of the display advertisements and PSAs are located in Appendix B.

Table 2-1 Media Notification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspapers</th>
<th>Dates Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Craig Daily Press</em></td>
<td>1/10/2011, 1/22/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vernal Express</em></td>
<td>1/12/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Glenwood Springs Post Independent</em></td>
<td>1/19/2011, 1/31/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Emery County Progress</em></td>
<td>1/18/2011, 2/2/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sun Advocate</em></td>
<td>1/20/2011, 2/1/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nephi Times News</em></td>
<td>1/26/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Millard County Chronicle Progress</em></td>
<td>1/26/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Richfield Reaper</em></td>
<td>2/2/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Salina Sun</em></td>
<td>2/2/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Iron County Today</em></td>
<td>2/2/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lincoln County Record</em></td>
<td>2/17/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Moapa Valley Progress</em></td>
<td>2/16/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Green River Star</em></td>
<td>2/23/2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-1  Media Notification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Radio</th>
<th>Requested Air Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KIFX</td>
<td>Requested PSA to air 1/20 – 2/24, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNEU</td>
<td>Requested PSA to air 1/20 – 2/24, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KVEL</td>
<td>Aired 6 times on 1/19/2011 as a news story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLCY</td>
<td>Aired 5 times on 1/20/2011 as a news story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KXRQ</td>
<td>Requested PSA to air 1/20 – 1/24, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KZMU (UT)</td>
<td>Requested PSA to air 1/24 – 2/1/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCYN (UT)</td>
<td>Requested PSA to air 1/24 – 2/1/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOAL (UT)</td>
<td>Requested PSA to air 1/24 – 2/1/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIFX</td>
<td>Requested PSA to air 1/24 – 2/7/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNEU</td>
<td>Requested PSA to air 1/24 – 2/7/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KVEL</td>
<td>Requested PSA to air 1/24 – 2/7/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSVC</td>
<td>Requested PSA to air 1/31 – 2/5/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSUU</td>
<td>Requested PSA to air 1/31 – 2/17/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSUU</td>
<td>Requested PSA to air 2/7 – 2/24/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KDXU</td>
<td>Requested PSA to air 2/16 – 2/24/2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Television</th>
<th>Requested Air Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABC 8 – Colorado</td>
<td>Requested PSA to air 1/17 – 1/31/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC 11 – Colorado</td>
<td>Requested PSA to air 1/17 – 1/31/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS 5 – Colorado</td>
<td>Requested PSA to air 1/17 – 1/31/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox 5 – Las Vegas</td>
<td>Requested PSA to air 2/14 – 3/3/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS 5 – Las Vegas</td>
<td>Requested PSA to air 2/14 – 3/3/2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, materials and information presented at the scoping meetings were compiled in a three-ring binder and distributed on January 21, 2011, to 23 public libraries located in communities where scoping meetings would be held for public access and review. A list of the libraries that received the scoping information is provided in Appendix C.

2.2.1 Consultation and Coordination with Federal, State, and Local Governments

The BLM and Western are engaged in coordination and consultation with federal, state, and local agencies about the potential for the proposed TWE Project and alternatives to affect sensitive resources (40 CFR, 1508.5; 1508.6; Forty Questions No. 14 [a], 14[b], 14[c], and the Council on Environmental Quality Advisory Memorandum, Designation of Non-Federal Agencies to Be Cooperating Agencies in Implementing the Procedural Requirements of NEPA, July 1999). The coordination and consultation must occur in a timely manner and are required before any final decisions are made. Issues related to
agency consultation include biological resources, cultural resources, socioeconomics, and land and water management. For example, biological resource consultations would apply to the potential for activities to disturb sensitive species or habitats; cultural resource consultations apply to the potential for impacts to important cultural archaeological and historic sites.

Prior to public scoping, 50 federal, state, and county governments were invited to participate as cooperating agencies for the TWE Project EIS. To-date, 32 agencies have accepted the invitation and are listed in Table 2-2.

Table 2-2   Cooperating Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Forest Service, Intermountain Region, Ogden, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service representing:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mountain Prairie Region, Lakewood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pacific Southwest Region, Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- South Pacific Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Northwestern Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy Region Southwest, San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Reclamation, Lower Colorado Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Indian Affairs Western Region, representing:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rocky Mountain Region, Billings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Southwest Region, Albuquerque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon County, Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield County, Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa County, Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moffat County, Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Blanco County, Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver County, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duchesne County, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emery County, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron County, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Snake River Conservation District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Bow Conservation District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little Snake River Conservation District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Bow Conservation District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the scoping period, several additional agencies and groups requested participation in the preparation of the EIS as a Cooperating Agency. Several organizations, representing the descendants of
the Mountain Meadows Massacre, are assisting in the development of the TWE Project Programmatic Agreement (PA). Table 2-3 below shows the status of these requests to participate as a Cooperating Agency in the TWE Project EIS as of May 24, 2011.

Table 2-3  Status of Additional Cooperating Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finalized with Signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOUs)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand County, Utah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUs still in Signature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetwater County, Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Creek Conservation District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White River Conservation District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUs in Preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-4 State Grazing Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.2 Tribal Government-to-Government Consultation

Federal agencies are responsible for compliance with a host of laws, Executive Orders (EOs) and Memoranda, treaties, departmental policies and other mandates regarding their legal relationships with and responsibilities to Native Americans. The government-to-government relationship that the U.S. has with federally recognized Indian Tribes started with the Commerce Clause of the U.S. Constitution where Tribes were recognized as sovereign nations, and has continued in federal laws and policies including but not limited to the National Historic Preservation Act, NEPA, Archaeological Resources Protect Act, American Indian Religious Freedom Act, Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act, and EOs 12875, 12898, 13077, and 13175. Compliance with this body of law requires consultation with Tribes on the effects of proposed actions. Specific guidance includes (but is not limited to) formal government-to-government consultation, discoveries of burials and Native American objects, and treatment of traditional cultural properties and sacred sites and landscapes. Under EO 13175, November 6, 2000, federal agencies are required to establish regular and meaningful consultation and collaboration with Native American tribal governments on the development of regulatory policies and issuance of permits that could significantly or uniquely affect their communities and/or their traditional territories. The BLM and Western sent letters to 48 tribes and pueblos notifying them about the proposed TWE Project on July 22, 2010. The letter included the TWE Project location, notification about the preparation of an EIS, and a request to provide BLM and Western with information about any known resources or places of traditional, cultural, and religious importance to the tribes. Three tribes, the Moapa Band of Paiutes, Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation, and the Las Vegas Paiute were sent a separate letter on July 27, 2010, because the proposed or alternative TWE Project corridors either cross nearby or are adjacent to reservation land.

To-date, the following seven tribes have responded to the initial notification and include: the Ely Shoshone, Duckwater Shoshone, Las Vegas Paiute, Paiute Tribe of Utah, Pueblo of Laguna, Pueblo of Santo Domingo, and Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation. Of these seven tribes, three tribes requested BLM and Western to attend their monthly tribal meetings to discuss the TWE Project. These tribes include the Paiute Tribe of Utah, Duckwater Shoshone, and Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation.
BLM and Western met with the Paiute Tribe of Utah on December 1, 2010, and the Duckwater Shoshone as well as the Ely Shoshone on January 12, 2011. In January of 2011, the Utah BLM contacted the Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation in response to their request for a meeting. During their discussion, the Goshute tribe determined that the proposed TWE Project was "not very close to their tribe," and therefore, no meeting would be necessary. Three tribes and pueblos (Pueblo of Laguna, Pueblo of Santo Domingo, and Las Vegas Paiute) returned a response indicating that the information provided in the letter notification was sufficient and no further consultation was necessary. The Ely Shoshone sent a response requesting more information about the TWE Project; the BLM contacted the tribe in August 2010 to discuss the TWE Project. Representatives from the Ely Shoshone attended the meeting on January 12, 2011, with BLM and Western. At this meeting, the Duckwater Shoshone requested large project maps of the areas where the proposed TWE Project could affect tribal lands. These maps were provided to the Duckwater Shoshone through the Ely, Nevada, BLM FO.

In early 2011, follow-up phone calls were made to all the tribes to update tribal contact information. New information was updated to the TWE Project's tribal contact list in preparation for a second letter to be mailed in the fall of 2011. The second letter will request more focused information regarding tribal concerns and sites, provide additional information about the consultation process, development of the PA, and findings from the file search conducted in the winter of 2010/2011.

Consultation with the tribes and pueblos will continue throughout the TWE Project as stipulated under EO 13175, November 6, 2000.

2.3 Scoping Meetings

Public Scoping Meetings

Public scoping meetings offer an opportunity for the public to participate in the TWE Project during the scoping period. The meetings promote information exchange about the proposed TWE Project and to gather public input. BLM and Western hosted 23 public scoping meetings throughout the project area with a total attendance of 678 individuals. The dates, locations, and number of public attendees at each of the public scoping meetings are provided in Table 2-4 below. All of the public scoping meetings were held from 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Location</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Number of Attendees that Signed In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vernal, Utah</td>
<td>Tuesday, January 25, 2011</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig, Colorado</td>
<td>Wednesday, January 26, 2011</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangely, Colorado</td>
<td>Thursday, January 27, 2011</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Junction, Colorado</td>
<td>Monday, January 31, 2022</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moab, Utah</td>
<td>Tuesday, February 1, 2011</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Dale, Utah</td>
<td>Wednesday, February 2, 2011</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duchesne, Utah</td>
<td>Monday, February 7, 2011</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nephi, Utah</td>
<td>Tuesday, February 8, 2011</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta, Utah</td>
<td>Wednesday, February 9, 2011</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richfield, Utah</td>
<td>Monday, February 14, 2011</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2-4  Scoping Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Location</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Number of Attendees that Signed In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milford, Utah</td>
<td>Tuesday, February 15, 2011</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar City, Utah</td>
<td>Wednesday, February 16, 2011</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George, Utah</td>
<td>Thursday, February 17, 2011</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Valley, Utah</td>
<td>Tuesday, February 22, 2011</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central, Utah</td>
<td>Wednesday, February 23, 2011</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise, Utah</td>
<td>Thursday, February 24, 2011</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caliente, Nevada</td>
<td>Monday, February 28, 2011</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overton (Moapa Valley), Nevada</td>
<td>Tuesday, February 29, 2011</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson, Nevada</td>
<td>Wednesday, March 1, 2011</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas, Nevada</td>
<td>Thursday, March 2, 2011</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawlins, Wyoming</td>
<td>Tuesday, March 8, 2011</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Springs, Wyoming</td>
<td>Wednesday, March 9, 2011</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baggs, Wyoming</td>
<td>Thursday, March 10, 2011</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ATTENDANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>678</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public scoping meetings were conducted as informal open houses to allow for an open exchange of information and provide the opportunity for attendees to ask agency personnel, the TWE Project applicant, and EIS contractor questions about the TWE Project. Attendees were greeted at the Welcome Station to sign in and record their attendance. Once they signed in, they were then invited to review the TWE Project and NEPA process information at seven additional stations:

1. TWE Project Scope and Applicant’s Purpose and Need;
2. NEPA and Agencies’ Purpose and Need;
3. Engineering/Construction/Maintenance;
4. Lands Acquisition;
5. Map Book Table;
6. GoogleEarth™ Demonstration; and
7. Geographic Information System (GIS) Comment Station.

Each information station had display boards and handouts/fact sheets to provide more detailed information. There were two display boards positioned in the center of the room; one showing the entire TWE Project area, the other showing a more regional map (depending on the meeting location). TWE Project map books also were displayed on tables in the center of the room at a scale of 1 to 12,000. Display boards and informational materials (excluding the map books) presented to the public at the scoping meetings are provided in Appendix D.
There were several opportunities for attendees to locate the area or parcel(s) of interest in relationship to the proposed TWE Project and corridor alternatives. Landowners could locate their property at the map book table and/or the GoogleEarth™ demonstration station, before proceeding to the GIS Comment Station.

Public meeting comments were electronically submitted at the GIS Comment Station. The proposed TWE Project and TWE Project alternatives were downloaded to the GIS program as well as parcel and land use information. Two GIS stations (computer, monitor, and color printer) were available to receive public comments. Each station was staffed with a GIS specialist and one comment facilitator. The GIS specialist retrieved the commenter’s parcel and/or area of concern and noted the area of concern. Commenters could visually view map notations on large, computer monitors. The comments were electronically transcribed and geospatially connected to the area noted on the map. Facilitators were available to ensure that the commenter’s input was accurately recorded. Commenters were provided a color printout of their comment with the associated map and a copy was retained for the TWE Project’s Administrative Record (AR). Hard copy comment forms also were available for those attendees who preferred to write and submit their comments at the meeting or to mail in them in at a later date.

2.4 County Commissioners’ Meetings

During the scoping period, BLM and Western met with representatives of several County Commissions. The meetings were scheduled to coincide with the scoping meeting in their respective county. The meetings provided TWE Project information and explain the EIS process. Packets containing the materials available to the public at the scoping meetings were distributed to the Commissioners. In addition to the County Commissioners, BLM and Western met with the Clark County, Nevada, Conservation Program on March 1, 2011.
3.0 Summary of Scoping Comments

The BLM and Western received a total of 622 comment submittals (e.g., letter, comment form, email) containing 2,319 individual comments during the public scoping period. Following the close of the public scoping period, comments were compiled and analyzed to identify issues and concerns. Within each comment submittal, individual comments were identified, reviewed, and entered into an electronic database. As comments were entered, contact information for the commenter was entered/updated in the TWE Project mailing list to ensure that all interested parties would receive project information throughout the EIS process. Once the comment was entered and the TWE Project mailing list updated, a unique record number was assigned to the comment submittal and registered in the TWE Project’s official AR.

Of the comment submittals received, six form letters were identified. Form letters are described as submittals that are identically written, but submitted by different individuals. Comments from the form letters were entered once into the database and each individual’s contact information was added to the TWE Project mailing list and assigned an AR number.

Once the individual comments were compiled in the database, reports were generated categorizing the issues first by TWE Project region (e.g., Wyoming to IPP, IPP to Las Vegas, Las Vegas to Marketplace) and then by resource (e.g., biology, corridor alternatives, geology, etc.). The summary reports were reviewed to identify data entry errors. Some of the comments may be categorized under one region, but could apply to another region as well. For example, the concern about introduction of noxious weeds may appear under the Wyoming to IPP Region, but may be a concern in the Las Vegas to Marketplace Region. A comprehensive list of the scoping comments is presented in Appendix A.
4.0 Identification of Issues

Information acquired during the scoping period assists the BLM and Western in identifying the potential environmental issues, alternative corridors, and mitigation measures associated with developing the proposed TWE Project. As previously discussed, the process provides a mechanism for narrowing the scope of issues so that the EIS can focus the analysis on areas of high interest and concern.

After evaluating the comments received during the scoping period, several key issues emerged. The following issues are topics that represent the most public concern about the proposed TWE Project.

Corridor Alternatives

Most of the comments were about corridor alternative locations. Concerns about a particular corridor alternative were related to avoidance of sensitive resources, including special status species habitat, impacts to visual resources, special designated areas, and/or historic or cultural sites. Some of the commenters were landowners concerned about public health and safety issues and impacts to property values.

Potential Private and Public Land Use Conflicts

Conflicts with existing or potential future land uses were a comment concern for many of the TWE Project alternatives. Corridor alternatives located in Colorado would conflict with private landowner property, new airport location, state lands, and federal special designated lands. Corridor alternative concerns within Wyoming primarily were associated with impacts to special status species, historic and cultural resources, and visual resources. In northern Utah, landowners in the Fruitland and Duchesne area were concerned that the TWE Project would conflict with agricultural activities and limit economic growth. Concerns about corridor alternatives ranged from impacts to reservoirs in northern Utah, agriculture lands, Uintah/Ashley National Forest, Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs), and the Mountain Meadows Massacre site. Numerous comments about conflicts with existing or potential future land uses came from the Las Vegas area, specifically north of Las Vegas (Apex), northwest Las Vegas, and the Henderson areas.

Impacts to Fish, Wildlife, Vegetation, Special Status Species, and Habitat

Comments about impacts to the Greater sage-grouse were of high concern in Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah. Wildlife concerns in Wyoming and Colorado included impacts to big game migration and winter/spring range habitat for elk, mule deer and pronghorn. There were numerous concerns about impacts to desert tortoise habitat in southern Utah and Nevada as well as impacts to bighorn sheep where the proposed TWE Project would traverse desert mountain ranges. Bird collisions with transmission lines were a concern throughout the TWE Project area.

Public Health and Safety

Numerous comments about public health and safety were received from areas where the proposed TWE Project crossed – or was adjacent to – private property. Residents in the community of Central, Utah, were concerned about co-locating the transmission line with gas pipelines and the potential for fire as well as concerns about firefighter safety in an area where wildland fires are a high risk. Several residents in Henderson, Nevada, voiced concerns about the effects of electromagnetic fields on humans, sabotage activities, and structure/conductor failure near homes. Increased construction traffic on roadways was a concern throughout the TWE Project area.

Impacts to Special Designated Areas

Throughout the TWE Project area, there were numerous comments about impacts to Special Designated Areas such as Areas of Environmental Concern, roadless Forest Service Lands, WSAs,
National Monuments/Landmarks, historic trails, and state and federal parks. Concerns were primarily associated with impacts to visual resources, degradation of environmental quality, and to visitors and recreational users.

**Cumulative Impacts**

The cumulative effects of numerous transmission lines being proposed within already overcrowded corridors was a concern throughout various geographies within the TWE Project area. Specific areas of concern were along Interstate 80 (I-80) in Wyoming, through the Dixie Forest and Central, Utah, and in the Las Vegas area on the east side of the Las Vegas Valley.

**Socioeconomic Impacts (Property Values and Tax Base)**

Many landowners were concerned about how the TWE Project would affect property values, particularly where the proposed TWE Project crosses private lands or was located near urban areas. Comments from landowners about property values primarily came from the Henderson, Nevada, area; however, this concern also was shared by landowners in Central, Utah and Colorado. Throughout the TWE Project area, there were some comments that saw the TWE Project as an economic benefit to their rural communities through expansion of their tax base and temporary employment during construction.

**Concerns About Mitigation/Reclamation and Noxious Weed Control**

TWE Project mitigation and reclamation were an important concern, particularly in areas where the proposed corridor and alternative corridors would impact Special Status Species and wildlife. Many of the comments provided recommendations such as construction timing, buffer zones, perching deterrents, and mitigation plans.

**Appendix A** summarizes the key concerns expressed during scoping. These key concerns were identified so BLM and Western can determine the alternative corridors and concerns to be analyzed in the EIS. The comments are arranged by TWE Project region and then by resource topic (e.g., Region A – Wyoming to Intermountain Power Project; Region B – Intermountain Power Project to Las Vegas; and Region C – Las Vegas to Marketplace). Each key concern that has a geographical reference is noted with a map identification number at the end of each comment (bolded). The map identification number corresponds to a location on the map, which is located at the end of each set of comments. Grid coordinates are provided parenthetically after each map identification for ease in locating the comment on the map.

For example, to locate a comment with the Map Identification Number of A-23, you would use the grid coordinates, H: 2 to locate the general area on the map. Within that area on the map, you would identify the Map Identification Number, A-23.
5.0 Activities Following Scoping

The NEPA process provides additional opportunities for public input. Following the scoping period, the Draft EIS will be prepared, incorporating information received from the public during the scoping period. Once the Draft EIS is completed, BLM and Western will publish the Notice of Availability in the Federal Register and distribute the draft document for public review. Because of the size and complexity of the TWE Project, preparing the Draft EIS could take several months (see Figure 5-1). During the Draft EIS review period, the public can comment on key issues and the adequacy of the purpose and need, alternatives analysis, impacts analysis, and proposed mitigation presented in the Draft EIS. Public hearings will take place to allow the public to formally present their comments. Public comments will be recorded by a court reporter. Figure 5-1 identifies additional opportunities and the anticipated schedule for the public to provide comments and participate in the EIS process. Comments received on the Draft EIS will be addressed in the Final EIS.

Figure 5-1 NEPA Process
Appendix A

Summary of Scoping Comments
Region A – Wyoming to Intermountain Power Project
Agriculture

- Concerns about impacts to agricultural activities, ability to irrigate, existing pivot irrigation, and pasture lands, around the Baggs, Wyoming area (Highway 789), Colorado, and the Vernal/Roosevelt City, Utah area. (Map ID: A-1; Map Coordinates: I-3)

- Alternative corridors should be sited to the east avoid agricultural areas near New Castle, Utah. (Map ID: A-2; Map Coordinates: F-4)

Air Quality

- Concerns about air quality and dust control measures during construction; in particular, where soils in Utah are not conducive to dust control. (Map ID: A-3; Map Coordinates: B-6)

Aquatic Species

- Potential impacts to aquatic species resulting from construction activities at stream crossings (Colorado squaw fish, cutthroat species). (Map ID: A-4; Map Coordinates: G-5)

- Construction mitigation measures should require 300-foot buffers on each side of a stream and decontamination of equipment to minimize the potential spread of invasive species.

Corridor Alternatives

Colorado

- The alternative corridor that parallels Highway 13 needlessly impacts the environment; commenters voiced opposition to this alternative corridor. (Map ID: A-5; Map Coordinates: H-4)

- Prefers the alternative corridor be sited along the Sevenmile Ridge. (Map ID: A-6; Map Coordinates: G-3)

- Does not support the far eastern corridor alternative in Colorado because of its impact to Moffat County residents and there are greater impacts to private landowners. (Map ID: A-7; Map Coordinates: I-4)

- Opposes alternative route that follows Interstate-70 through DeBeque Canyon, around the base of Mt. Garfield, along the Book Cliffs to the Mesa County line. (Map ID: A-8; Map Coordinates: H-6)

- Segments C180 and C190 could impact the proposed relocation of the Grand Junction Regional Airport. (Map ID: A-9; Map Coordinates: H-6)

- Recommendation to eliminate the corridor alternative through Big Hole Gulch, Great Divide, and Axial Basin because of impacts to sage-grouse core areas and habitat. (Map ID: A-10; Map Coordinates: H-3)

- The corridor alternatives through the BLM Little Snake FO is unacceptable because of impacts to greater sage-grouse, sensitive wildlife habitat, state trust lands, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs), and Citizen’s Proposed Wilderness Areas; the Craig/Meeker corridor alternative has less impacts. (Map ID: A-11; Map Coordinates: H-3, I-3)

- The proposed corridor in the BLM White River Office FO exiting Colorado crosses sage-grouse habitat and a State Wildlife area (SWA); however, it presents the least impacts. (Map ID: A-12; Map Coordinates: G-4)

- The Grand Junction to Utah corridor alternative could impact private landowners, visual resources (Mt. Garfield) and special designations. (Map ID: A-13; Map Coordinates: G-6)
Wyoming

- The US 191 – Little Mountain – Red Creek routes should be eliminated from consideration because of impacts to high quality scenic and recreation resources. (Map ID: A-14: Map Coordinates: F-3)
- Prefers the corridor segment that follows I-80. (Map ID: A-15: Map Coordinates: I-1)
- Conflicts with co-location with other proposed transmission line projects along I-80. (Map ID: A-16: Map Coordinates: I-1)
- Corridor alternative along Highway 13 near Baggs could impact sage-grouse habitat. (Map ID: A-17: Map Coordinates: H-2)
- Prefers corridor alternative from Baggs, Wyoming, to Craig, Colorado. (Map ID: A-18: Map Coordinates: I-3)
- The proposed TWE Project should include the alternative from Rawlins to Aeolus to gain access to wind energy in the Laramie Range. (Map ID: A-19: Map Coordinates: J-1)
- Opposition to any route that follows Highway 789 through Baggs or east of Flaming Gorge Reservoir. (Map ID: A-20: Map Coordinates: H-2, G-2)
- Prefers the “Underground Utility Corridor” east of Highway 789 to avoid impacts to sage-grouse. (Map ID: A-21: Map Coordinates: H-2)
- Wyoming Wildlife Federation opposes the far eastern route because of potential impacts to fish and wildlife. (Map ID: A-22: Map Coordinates: H-2)
- Prefers the two western routes near Rawlins to avoid impacts to mule deer migration corridors and winter range. (Map ID: A-23: Map Coordinates: H-2)
- Opposes any corridor that would impact sage-grouse core areas, Adobe Town, and any features within the Willow Creek Rim, Haystack, and Powder Mountain. (Map ID: A-24: Map Coordinates: H-3)
- Prefers the proposed corridor because it would avoid crossing the Overland and Cherokee Trails. (Map ID: A-25: Map Coordinates: H-2)
- Prefers the corridor alternative along Highway 789 because it avoids cultural resources and minimizes visual impacts. (Map ID: A-26: Map Coordinates: H-2)
- Sweetwater County opposes any corridor alternative that impacts natural features and viewsheds in the eastern portion of the county. (Map ID: A-27: Map Coordinates: H-2)
- Prefer the corridor alternative be sited south of the Rawlins Water Treatment Plant. (Map ID: A-28: Map Coordinates: I-1)
- Suggests the alternative corridor go south on I-80 near Fort Steele to avoid Fort Steele, and residents north of the interstate. (Map ID: A-29: Map Coordinates: J-1)

Utah

- Prefers the proposed Utah corridor alternative, but the alternative would clip Roadless Areas and Citizen Proposed Wilderness Areas.
- Opposes the proposed TWE Project corridor near the Strawberry River below the dam. (Map ID: A-30: Map Coordinates: C-5)
- No proposed or alternative corridors should be sited near the Fruitland, Utah area. (Map ID: A-31: Map Coordinates: D-4)
- Concerned about the corridor alternative that passes through the San Rafael Swell in Emery County. (Map ID: A-32: Map Coordinates: D-6)
The proposed corridor through Duchesne and Uintah/Ashley Forest would have negative natural resource impacts. (Map ID: A-33: Map Coordinates: C-5, D-4)

Opposes any corridor alternative through the Mexican Mountain WSA. (Map ID: A-34: Map Coordinates: D-7)

A corridor alternative along State Route (SR) 10 in Utah could potentially impact threatened and endangered plant species. (Map ID: A-35: Map Coordinates: C-7)

Corridor alternatives in the Diamond Mountain area could impact sage-grouse and should be eliminated. (Map ID: A-36: Map Coordinates: F-4)

Concerns about the proposed corridor impacting reservoir operations on the north side of Starvation Reservoir and the south side of Strawberry Reservoir. (Map ID: A-37: Map Coordinates: C-5, D-4)

Opposes the U145 corridor alternative because of conflicts with state trust lands for mineral and surface development. (Map ID: A-38: Map Coordinates: A-6)

Corridor segments U55, U70, U90, U10, and U20 would impact Wildlife Management Areas. (Map ID: A-39: Map Coordinates: F-4)

The proposed corridor through the Wasatch needs to be kept narrow to avoid impacts. (Map ID: A-40: Map Coordinates: B-5)

Prefers corridor alternative north of Vernal because it follows existing corridors. (Map ID: A-41: Map Coordinates: F-4)

In the area near the Intermountain Power Project, the transmission line corridor should be co-located with existing lines. (Map ID: A-42: Map Coordinates: A-6)

General Comments on Corridor Alternatives

Prefers the proposed corridor because it makes use of existing utility corridors, has less impacts to private landowners, and has a reduced impact to visual resources.

Prefers using corridors within existing corridors to minimize greenfield effect.

Many landowners preferred the proposed corridor.

Prefers the proposed TWE Project stay on federal lands.

Cultural Resources

Concerns about additional human activity resulting in impacts to cultural resources.

Concerns about impacts to the sensitive landscapes near Adobe Town in Wyoming. (Map ID: A-43: Map Coordinates: H-2)

Concerned about impacts to the Old Spanish Trail in Utah. (Map ID: A-44: Map Coordinates: C-7, B-7, E-7, D-6)

TWE Project impacts to cultural resources near the Book Cliffs up Sego Canyon (Utah). (Map ID: A-45: Map Coordinates: E-7)

Concerned about impacts to the Old Uintah Railway (Colorado). (Map ID: A-46: Map Coordinates: G-6, F-5)

Cumulative Impacts

Concerned about the cumulative effects of additional proposed transmission line projects in Sweetwater County, Wyoming. (Map ID: A-47: Map Coordinates: G-2)
• Colorado Department of Wildlife is concerned about the cumulative effects to big game species and habitat resulting from the TWE Project as well as other energy projects proposed in Colorado. (Map ID: A-48: Map Coordinates: H-4)

• TWE Project development could encourage additional transmission lines to be built (Utah).

• Concerned about the TWE Project’s cumulative effects to land disturbance with the oil and gas development (Utah). (Map ID: A-49: Map Coordinates: E-4)

• The EIS should address cumulative impacts of the TWE Project and additional proposed land use actions.
  − Additional oil and gas leasing (Colorado)
  − Proposed wind farm west of Medicine Bow and east of the Laramie Range (Wyoming)
  − Proposed nuclear power plant (Blue Castle Project) (Utah)
  − Proposed new residential development in the City of Ballard (Utah)

• Cumulative effects of additional transmission lines on landowner property.

**Engineering/Design**

• Prefers 4-legged structures to the guyed structures; guyed structures increase bird mortality.

• Transmission towers and access roads should not be constructed in the Strawberry River Valley below the dam. Road access to existing power line should be used (Utah). (Map ID: A-50: Map Coordinates: C-5)

• Concerned about increased congestion at the Clover substation (Utah). (Map ID: A-51: Map Coordinates: B-5)

• Design should consider burying the transmission line to reduce visual impacts, minimize environmental impacts, reduce public safety issues, and preserve real estate values.

• Concerns about co-locating the proposed TWE and proposed Gateway projects along I-80 while maintaining adequate separation (Wyoming). (Map ID: A-52: Map Coordinates: H-2)

• Reference center lines need to be identified and provided for public input to assist in maximizing separation between for the TWE and Gateway projects within the 2-mile-wide corridors.

• Question about whether power could be transmitted from the Craig Power Plant.

• Question about whether wind turbines could interconnect with proposed transmission line.

• Suggests a substation along Interstate 70 (I-70) to deliver electricity to areas with inadequate power (Utah). (Map ID: A-53: Map Coordinates: E-7)

• Construction should occur during mid-July and end of September (Colorado).

**Fire Management**

• BLM lands between Rangely, Colorado, and the Utah border are considered “let burn wildfire areas.” (Map ID: A-54: Map Coordinates: G-5)

• Road and traffic impacts could increase fire potential.

**Geology**

• Corridor through the Rangely, Colorado, area has rough terrain and very unstable and erosive soils. (Map ID: A-55: Map Coordinates: G-5)

• Geologic formations within the San Rafael Swell and the Green River-Grand Valley area are susceptible to sinkholes and subsidence (Utah). (Map ID: A-56: Map Coordinates: E-7, D-7)
- The Carmel, Moenkopi, Chinle Formations and the Arapien and Mancos Shale are difficult for construction (Utah).

**Hazardous Materials**
- The EIS should discuss the likelihood of vehicular spills or hazardous material releases.

**Lands and Realty**
- Concerned about adverse impacts (visual, property values) to private lands with the eastern most alternative (Wyoming). (Map ID: A-57: Map Coordinates: H-3)
- The proposed corridor through Horse Canyon would devalue landowner’s property.
- Concerned about impacts to city utilities located within the corridors (Utah).
- Supports siting the transmission line on public lands over private lands (Colorado).
- Objects to a one-time payment to landowners in return for decades of land use and doesn’t offset the resulting environmental effects (Wyoming).
- Local governments need to make separate determinations regarding the TWE Project’s consistency with local plans, ordinances, ROW use, and permitting.
- Concerned about trespassing issues in the Elk Springs area (Colorado). (Map ID: A-58: Map Coordinates: G-4)
- The Uinta Tribe would possibly favor a corridor through their new jurisdiction land, if granted. (Map ID: A-59: Map Coordinates: E-4)
- Concerns about how landowners would be compensated for granting a ROW on their land.

**Livestock Grazing**
- TWE Project access roads would interfere with grazing activities.
- Concern about magnetic fields and their effects on livestock.
- Construction work force could impact grazing operations.
- TWE Project development should avoid clearing trees, as trees provide protection for livestock.
- Concerns about TWE Project development impacts to good pastureland.
- Concerned about impacts to grazing on the Cripple Cowboy Cow Outfit land near Rangely, Colorado. (Map ID: A-60: Map Coordinates: G-5)
- The transmission line’s “buzzing” affects horses, sheep, and livestock (Wyoming).

**Mineral Resources**
- Concerns about impacts to existing coal leases through Cottonwood Canyon (Map ID: A-138; Map Coordinates: C-6)
- TWE Project alternative corridor could potentially impact coal resource area. (Map ID: A-139; Map Coordinates: C-6)

**Mitigation/Reclamation**
- Recommend following the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources for reduced disturbance within buffer zone of sage-grouse leks and sage-grouse critical breeding and nesting periods.
- Mitigation measures to reduce impacts to bald eagles along the North Platte River should be identified in the EIS. (Map ID: A-61: Map Coordinates: J-1)
• Prompt project reclamation and long-term monitoring of noxious weeds where the TWE Project crosses the Red Rim/Daley Wildlife Habitat Management Unit should be included in the EIS (Wyoming). *(Map ID: A-62: Map Coordinates: I-1)*
• Environmental training about public lands laws and Wyoming Game and Fish regulations should be conducted.
• A plan for detection, prevention, control, and treatment procedures for noxious weeds should be developed.
• Adequate mitigation measures for protection of the Wyoming pocket gopher should be identified.
• Unavoidable wetland impacts should be compensated through restoration (preferably), creation, and enhancement.
• Mitigation measures should include discussion about funding, permitting, measurement of success, and time frames (Colorado).
• Active raptor nests should be identified prior to construction to avoid loss of active sites.
• Power lines should be raptor-safe and have adequate separation between conductors and grounded hardware.
• Recommend no construction from November 15 – April 30 in big game crucial winter habitat (Wyoming).
• A comprehensive monitoring and unanticipated cultural resources discovery plan is required (Wyoming).
• Construction schedules will have to be in accordance with timing limitations in the BLM RMP (Colorado).
• Mitigation measures should be developed if impacts to greater sage-grouse lek and core sites; and white-tailed prairie dog, ferruginous hawk, bald eagle, elk, and mule-deer habitat occur (Colorado – Sevenmile Ridge area). *(Map ID: A-63: Map Coordinates: H-2)*
• TWE Project development should avoid impacts to sensitive species such as sage-grouse (following Wyoming’s sage-grouse conservation strategy) and black-footed ferret in the Uinta Basin (Utah). *(Map ID: A-64: Map Coordinates: F-4)*
• Raptor nests should be avoided and perching deterrents should be installed (Colorado).

**NEPA Process**

- The NEPA process should evaluate TWE Project effects to the Dinosaur National Monument (Colorado). *(Map ID: A-65: Map Coordinates: F-4)*
- Utah Mitigation Commission requests being a Cooperating Agency because of the potential for the TWE Project to impact Mitigation Commission lands in Duchesne and Uintah counties (Utah).
- Suggest coordination with the Bureau of Reclamation – Provo Area Office concerning the proposed TWE Project corridor’s vicinity to Starvation Reservoir and Soldier Creek Dam on Strawberry Reservoir (Utah). *(Map ID: A-66: Map Coordinates: C-5, D-4)*
- Request the EIS and permitting process be expedited.
- Sweetwater County, Wyoming, requests to participate in the EIS Process as a Cooperating Agency.
- Additional alternatives, including in-state power generation and geothermal energy should be considered in the EIS (Utah).
• The EIS should analyze and describe methods for staying consistent with BLM’s recently released Instructional Memorandum for renewable energy projects.

• The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers request consultation to determine the presence of wetlands and for Section 404 permitting.

• EO 13007 should be addressed in the EIS separate from Section 106.

• The EIS should address the outcome of tribal consultation.

• The USFWS has been designated as a Cooperating Agency and agrees to serve on the interdisciplinary team for the EIS analysis.

• Formal consultation with the USFWS is required.

• Requests that the Alliance for Historic Wyoming be considered an interested party for all consultations under Section 106.

Noise

• TWE Project noise could adversely impact the Dinosaur National Monument’s soundscape (Colorado). (Map ID: A-67: Map Coordinates: F-4)

• Roads and tower construction noise could impact the Ashley, Uintah, Manti La Sal, and Dixie National Forests (Utah). (Map ID: A-68: Map Coordinates: A-6, B-5, C-5, )

• TWE Project noise from the alternative route parallel to SR 31 (Huntington Canyon), which is a scenic byway, could degrade the outdoor experience (Utah). (Map ID: A-69: Map Coordinates: C-6)

• Concerns about noise from the transmission line in the Baggs, Wyoming, and Laramie Peak area (Wyoming). (Map ID: A-70: Map Coordinates: I-3)

• Landowner concerns about noise in relation to their homes.

Noxious Weeds (also see Mitigation/Reclamation comments)

• Pre- and post-construction weed mapping should be required and post-construction reclamation needs to be included in the EIS.

• Use of herbicides should be avoided in the portion of corridor alternative that passes through the Wasatch Plateau where off-road vehicle trails are near roadless areas (Utah). (Map ID: A-71: Map Coordinates: C-6)

• Landowner concerns about noxious weeds in an area where vegetation is fragile (Utah).

Opinion

• Moffat County residents support natural resource development and the TWE Project (Colorado). (Map ID: A-72: Map Coordinates: H-3)

• Supports the TWE Project and the proposed corridor.

• Opposes the TWE Project through Sand Wash Basin in northwest Colorado. (Map ID: A-73: Map Coordinates: H-4)

• The TWE Project would have negative impacts to private property north of Craig, Colorado. (Map ID: A-74: Map Coordinates: I-4)

• The TWE corridors within Mesa County, Colorado, do not benefit the county. (Map ID: A-75: Map Coordinates: G-6)

• Strongly oppose the TWE Project through Leamington Canyon in Millard County, Utah. (Map ID: A-76: Map Coordinates: A-6)
Sweetwater County supports the TWE Project.

The TWE Project will facilitate the exploitation of unsustainably resources in Wyoming and cause environmental degradation (Wyoming).

The TWE Project is an example of Colorado’s commitment to clean energy development.

The TWE Project will litter 429 miles of Utah with even more transmission lines.

Move the wind farm to Nevada, closer to the end customer – this is a waste of our taxes and a typical government over spend (Wyoming).

Emery County, Utah, is generally supportive of the alternative corridors.

Paleontological Resources

The EIS should address paleontological resources that could be affected.

Permitting

Colorado Permitting Comments

− Conditional Use Permit required in Mesa County, followed by submittal of Major Site Plan Application.
− The TWE Project must apply for the appropriate county approvals and landowner ROWs.

Wyoming Permitting Comments

− Construction use permits currently not required in Sweetwater County, but that could change.
− Short-term facilities will require a Conditional Use permit in Sweetwater County.
− Construction Use permits are required for any substations, transformer stations, or similar long-term facilities.
− The County Engineer must be contacted before moving heavy equipment over county roads.
− Crossing, access, or utilization of road ROW for utility purposes requires an access permit or a license from the County Engineer.
− Work camps and electrical facilities for the proposed TWE Project need to be permitted.

Public Health and Safety

Concerned about safety of project vehicles on public road to the Soldier Creek Dam Road (US 40) (Utah). (Map ID: A-77: Map Coordinates: C-5)

Sweetwater County, Wyoming, recommends that the TWE Project applicant maintain communication with potentially affected communities regarding county services such as law enforcement and health services (Wyoming).

Concerned about safety issues associated with the transmission line parallel to the CIG gas pipeline ROW. (Map ID: A-78: Map Coordinates: H-2)

Conductor needs to be hung high over road crossings.

Concerned about health risks to people, wildlife, and vegetation from electromagnetic fields.

Concerned about impacts to law enforcement resulting from an increase in construction workers in the area (Colorado).

General landowner concerns about living near high voltage transmission lines.

All guy wires and transmission lines should be marked to eliminate aerial collision hazards.
Public Participation

- Approves scoping process for the TWE Project; scoping meetings were complete and staff professional and knowledgeable.
- The TWE Project needs to correct contact information for the University of Utah.
- Public participation process needs to be maintained for the best interest of stakeholders and the TWE Project.
- BLM needs to continue to provide opportunities for public involvement.
- Several requests to be added to the TWE Project mailing list.
- Thompson Spring residents would like to have notification of any TWE Project-related information meetings and a meeting their area if the corridor, near their community, is retained (Utah). (Map ID: A-79: Map Coordinates: E-7)

Purpose and Need

- Supports the applicant’s purpose and need to expand the energy infrastructure and maintain a reliable electric grid.
- Applicant’s purpose and need should discuss market, end users, locations to be served, and the states’ renewable energy goals.
- The EIS should include an analysis of the TWE Project’s purpose and need.
- The EIS should address the need for power in the Southwest from the TWE Project and other projects.
- The TWE Project will help meet customer demand, improve the electric system reliability, increase access to the grid, and expand economic development (Wyoming).
- Need for the TWE Project in Daggett County needs to be addressed, since it appears there is over load on existing lines (Utah). (Map ID: A-80: Map Coordinates: F-4)
- Commenter would like some assurance that the line is being built for renewable energy (Utah).

Recreation

- The TWE Project could negatively impact recreation in the Strawberry River area (Utah). (Map ID: A-81: Map Coordinates: C-5)
- Public recreation areas within the proposed corridor need to be protected (Utah).
- The proposed corridor near the northwest boundary of the Dinosaur National Monument will impact visitor experience. (Map ID: A-82: Map Coordinates: F-4)
- The US 191 – Little Mountain – Red Creek corridor alternative would impact high quality scenic and recreation resources (Wyoming). (Map ID: A-83: Map Coordinates: F-3, F-4)
- Big game is a valuable recreation and economic resource. Concern about TWE Project impacts to big game species and habitat (Colorado).
- The TWE Project traffic and construction crews could impact recreation (Wyoming).
- The Draft EIS should recommend off-road vehicle use through the Wasatch Plateau be deterred (Utah). (Map ID: A-84: Map Coordinates: C-6)
- Would like for access roads to be available for public use (off-road vehicles and other recreation uses) and not closed.
- In Wyoming, the westernmost alternative near Rock Springs could impact recreational users that hunt and camp (Wyoming). (Map ID: A-85: Map Coordinates: G-2)
Concerns about impacts to outdoor recreation, particularly hunting if alternative corridors are used for TWE Project development (Wyoming).

Concerns about impacts to hunting areas and state wildlife and ranching program (Colorado).

Concerned about impacts to tourism and visitors to Fort Steele (Wyoming). (Map ID: A-86: Map Coordinates: J-1)

Socioeconomics

The TWE Project would bring much needed jobs and beneficial tax moneys to Moffat County, Colorado. (Map ID: A-87: Map Coordinates: H-3)

General landowner concerns about reduced property values.

The proposed TWE Project will hinder agricultural and economic growth (Utah).

General landowner concern about the proposed transmission line being sited over homes.

Concern about impacts to property values and development opportunities in Mesa County, Colorado. (Map ID: A-88: Map Coordinates: G-6)

The EIS should include the monetary impact to private landowners for each alternative.

The economic benefits to the applicant should be discussed in the EIS.

Support for the TWE Project as it will benefit the economy of rural Utah.

Concern about the proposed TWE Project adversely affecting property values in Nephi, Utah. (Map ID: A-89: Map Coordinates: B-5)

Support for the alternative corridor following I-70 through Grand County, Utah because of the economic benefits the TWE Project would bring (Utah). (Map ID: A-90: Map Coordinates: F-7)

General landowner concerns about condemnation of their homes.

The EIS should analyze the socioeconomic benefits to Wyoming and entire western region resulting from TWE Project development.

Soils

TWE Project development located on alkali soils would be difficult/impossible to reclaim (Utah).

Ecosystem in eastern Utah is very fragile and contains cryptobiotic soils (Utah).

Soils on steep ridges are very shallow and highly erosive (Utah).

Soils in the Green River Formation are difficult to reclaim and should be re-seeded with salt-tolerant species.

Special Designated Lands

Colorado

The proposed and alternative corridors could impact the following Wilderness areas: Cross Mountain, Yampa River, Black Mountain/Windy Gulch Pinyon Ridge, Oil Spring Mountain, Grand Hogback, Roan Plateau, Prairie Canyon, Bitter Creek, Demaree Canyon, Bitter Brush SWA, and Piceance SWA. (Map ID: A-91: Map Coordinates: G-6, G-5, H-5, H-4, G-4)

Concern about TWE Project impacts to Colorado’s Canyon Wilderness Proposal.

Potential impacts to sensitive habitat and proposed wilderness in the corridor alternatives that cross the Little Snake Resource area.

The Sevenmile Ridge alternative corridor crosses Colorado State Trust Lands, WSA, and Citizen Proposed Wilderness areas; recommends avoiding these land designations. (Map ID: A-92: Map Coordinates: G-4)
• The alternative corridor that passes through the Meeker/Rifle area could impact special land
designations and Citizen’s Wilderness Proposals.  (Map ID: A-93: Map Coordinates: H-5)
• The alternative corridors that cross the BLM White River FO impact a state wildlife area.
(Map ID: A-94: Map Coordinates: G-5, H-5)
• The Rifle/Grand Junction corridor alternative could impact special designated lands and should be avoided.  (Map ID: A-95: Map Coordinates: H-6)
• Brown’s Park ACEC was created as mitigation habitat for the Flaming Gorge Reservoir and should be avoided and preserved.  (Map ID: A-96: Map Coordinates: F-3)
• Concerned about impacts to wild horses in the Sand Wash Basin Herd Management Area.
(Map ID: A-97: Map Coordinates: H-4)

Utah

• The proposed corridor through Utah could impact Citizen Proposed Wilderness Areas.
• Concern about impacts to the Mexican Mountain Wilderness Area; the alternative corridor through this wilderness area is unacceptable.  (Map ID: A-98: Map Coordinates: D-7)
• Concerned about impacts to Wildlife Management areas crossed by Corridor Segments U55, U70, U90, U10, and U20.  (Map ID: A-99: Map Coordinates: B-6, B-5, D-4, F-3)

Wyoming

• Concerned about potential impacts to Citizen Proposed Wilderness Areas and Adobe Town.  (Map ID: A-100; Map Coordinates: H-2)
• Concerned about Wyoming alternative crossing the Greater Red Creek ACEC and impacts to big game migration.  (Map ID: A-101; Map Coordinates: F-3)
• Concerned about impacts to wildlife through the Red Rim/Daley Wildlife Habitat Management Unit.  (Map ID: A-102; Map Coordinates: I-2)
• Wilderness inventories will need to be conducted and the appropriate mitigation imposed; new Wildlands policy needs to be considered.
• The TWE Project needs to consider all sage-grouse core designations for all alternative corridors in Wyoming.
• Corridor alternatives should avoid the Fort Fred Steele State Historic Site.  (Map ID: A-103; Map Coordinates: J-1)

Special Status Species

Colorado

• The BLM Little Snake FO recommends elimination of the Great Divide alternative corridor (C40, C60, C85) to avoid impacts to greater sage-grouse.  (Map ID: A-104; Map Coordinates: H-4, H-3)
• Any corridor alternative that follows Highway 13 would impact greater sage-grouse and black-footed ferret.  (Map ID: A-105; Map Coordinates: I-3)
• Any proposed corridor alternative through Big Hole Gulch and Great Divide as well as Axial Basin should be eliminated because of the potential impacts to the greater sage-grouse.  (Map ID: A-106; Map Coordinates: H-3)
• All of the corridor alternatives could potentially impact Columbian sharp-tailed grouse lek and production areas.
• The corridor alternatives in Colorado cross the black-footed ferret Wolf Creek introduction area. (Map ID: A-107; Map Coordinates: G-4)

• The corridor alternatives in Colorado could impact Gibben’s Penstemon and the Narrow-leaf Primrose.

• The TWE Project corridor alternatives north of Craig, Colorado, could potentially impact sage-grouse habitat, bald eagle nests, and black-footed ferret habitat. (Map ID: A-108; Map Coordinates: I-4)

• The corridor alternative from Grand Junction, Colorado, to the Utah border could impact rare plants. (Map ID: A-109; Map Coordinates: G-6)

• The corridor alternative east of the Book Cliffs could potentially impact sage-grouse core areas. (Map ID: A-110; Map Coordinates: H-6)

• Rare plants, Debeque milkvetch (*Astragalus debequaeus*) (and Uinta Basin hookless cactus *Sclerocactus glaucus*, could potentially be impacted from TWE Project development based on previous survey work conducted in 1998.

• Corridor alternatives could potentially impact the rare plant, Debeque phacelia (*Phacelia submutica*).

**Utah**

• Concerned about impacts to golden eagle nest and native cutthroat trout.

• Commenter noted rare plants could be located along corridor alternative near Utah State Highway 10, west of the San Rafael Swell. (Map ID: A-111; Map Coordinates: C-7)

• Uintah Basin Adaptive Resource Management Group supports any measures to reduce the potential impacts to sage-grouse populations.

• Concerned about TWE Project impacts to the Columbia spotted frog, which is a Conservation Species and state sensitive species in Utah.

**Wyoming**

• The EIS should evaluate impacts to burrowing owls and prairie dog towns along the Fort Steele breaks between Rawlins and the North Platte River. (Map ID: A-112; Map Coordinates: I-1)

• Concerned about TWE Project impacts to the bald eagle along the North Platte River. (Map ID: A-113; Map Coordinates: I-1)

• The proposed TWE Project should adhere to the Wyoming Sage-Grouse Core Area Program guidelines.

• Adequate mitigation should be included in the EIS to reduce impacts to the Wyoming pocket gopher.

• The TWE Project plans should be designed to meet the objectives of conservation agreements for the Columbia spotted frog and Northern Goshawk if these species are impacted.

• The EIS should discuss the potential impact to pygmy rabbits.

• Concerned about mountain plover impacts on the proposed corridor.

**Systems Alternatives**

• Consider constructing a plant in Fort Duchesne or Vernal to service eastern Utah.

• Suggests building a substation along I-70 in Utah to make additional power available to an area that lacks available sources.
• Suggests that other sources of power have the capability to interconnect such as the proposed nuclear power station (Blue Castle project) in Utah.

Transportation and Access

• The proposed TWE Project should use the access roads for existing power lines.
• Concerns about increased traffic and human presence displacing wildlife into adjacent habitats.
• The southernmost corridor alternative in Utah, in the vicinity of Sears Canyon, is more accessible.
• Concerns about TWE Project access roads interfering with grazing activities.
• General landowners concerns about access roads on their property.
• Crossing, access, or utilization of road ROW for utility purposes will require an access permit from County Engineer (Wyoming).
• Concerns about an increased number of animal-vehicle collisions because of increased construction traffic (Colorado).
• Permanent access roads should be designed to minimize unpermitted off-road vehicle use.
• Commenter would like to see access roads open for public use.
• Access roads will require changes to the Forest Service Travel Management Plan.

Vegetation (also see Special Status Species)

• Concerns about TWE Project impacts to vegetation if water sources from the National Forests are affected (Utah).
• Requests a vegetation management plan be prepared that includes noxious weeds.
• The EIS should address impacts to vegetation resulting from access road construction.
• General landowner concerns about removal of trees on their property.

Visual Resources

Colorado

• The alternative corridor in Garfield County, Colorado would impact visual resources. (Map ID: A-114; Map Coordinates: H-6)
• Crossing any portion of western Colorado will impact visual landscapes.
• Concerns about visual impacts to the corridor alternative that follows I-70 through DeBeque Canyon, around the base of Mt. Garfield and then along the base of the Book Cliffs to the Mesa County line. (Map ID: A-115; Map Coordinates: G-6)
• The Energy Master Plan states that transmission lines will be designed with due consideration to visual resources; therefore, the proposed TWE Project needs to consider visual impacts to DeBeque Canyon, Book Cliffs, and the Colorado River. (Map ID: A-116: Map Coordinates: G-6)
• Requests that the BLM avoid areas with wilderness characteristics and to not impact viewsheds.
• Alternative corridors should follow existing pipeline corridors to avoid transmission line views from the river.
Utah

- Corridor alternative northwest of Dinosaur National Monument would impact the viewshed and diminish visitors’ experience. (Map ID: A-117: Map Coordinates: F-4)

- Concerns about impacts to visual quality near the Starvation Reservoir and the Strawberry Reservoir/Soldier Dam. (Map ID: A-118: Map Coordinates: C-5, D-4)

- Transmission line should be sited east of the existing power line to limit visual impacts to residents in Pine Hollow. (Map ID: A-119: Map Coordinates: C-5)

- The portion of the corridor alternative near Sears Canyon would impact the viewshed. (Map ID: A-120: Map Coordinates: F-3)

- Access roads and transmission line tower construction would impact the visual quality in the Ashley, Uintah, Manti La Sal, and Dixie National Forests. (Map ID: A-121: Map Coordinates: B-7, A-6, C-6, B-5, C-5)

- Concerns about visual resource impacts to SR 31 (Huntington Canyon), which is a scenic byway. (Map ID: A-122: Map Coordinates: C-6)

- Concerns about visual impacts to the Red Cliffs area.

Wyoming

- Preference to the proposed corridor in Wyoming because this corridor would have the least amount of impacts to visual resources.

- The TWE Project development in the eastern corridor alternative (along Highway 13) in Wyoming would result in impacts to visual resources. (Map ID: A-123: Map Coordinates: H-2)

- The TWE Project development should not occur near scenic trails (e.g., Cherokee Trail), Adobe Town, and Citizen Proposed Wilderness Areas to preserve visual quality. (Map ID: A-124: Map Coordinates: H-3, G-2, I-1)

- Concerns about impacts to scenic quality and important viewsheds such as Little Mountain, Pine Mountain, Miller Mountain, Tepee Mountain, and Richards Mountain. (Map ID: A-125: Map Coordinates: F-3)

- General landowner concerns about impacts to landscapes and viewsheds and its effects on property values if transmission lines are built near homes.

- Concerned about impacts to Laramie Peak. (Map ID: A-126; Map Coordinates: 50 miles east of TWE Project area)

- Sweetwater County, Wyoming, request that the eastern corridor be avoided because of the impacts to natural features and viewsheds.

- Concerned about impacts to visual resources if transmission lines are sited outside of existing ROWs.

- The EIS should include visual simulations of the TWE Project looking south of Rawlins, Wyoming. (Map ID: A-127: Map Coordinates: I-1)

Water Resources

- The corridor alternative that follows part of the Deep Cut Irrigation Ditch has a high water table and would not support transmission line structures (Colorado).

- There are source water protection zones around springs that provide the city with drinking water (Utah).

- The TWE Project could impact water resources flowing from the National Forests (Utah).
• The northern alternative corridor could impact Tyzack Aqueduct and the Jensen Drains in the Bureau of Reclamation’s Upper Colorado Region (Utah). (Map ID: A-128: Map Coordinates: F-4)

• The EIS needs to describe the waterbodies and groundwater resource that could be affected by the proposed TVE Project.

• The EIS needs conduct an analysis of the area’s topography, soils, and stream stability to assess impacts to surface and subsurface water quality (Colorado).

• The EIS needs to describe the natural drainage patterns within the project area and determine if project facilities are within a 50- or 100-year floodplain.

• Information regarding project impacts to impaired waters within the project area should be provided in the EIS.

• The EIS should analyze the function and locations of ephemeral drainages within the project area.

• The Yampa River floods and transmission line structures should not be located in the river floodplain. (Map ID: A-129: Map Coordinates: H-4, G-4)

• The most southern corridor alternative in Utah is preferred because it is not located within a municipal watershed.

• North of I-80, east of Fort Steele is a floodplain; suggests moving the proposed corridor alternative south of I-80 (Wyoming). (Map ID: A-130: Map Coordinates: J-1)

Wildlife (also see Special Status Species)

Colorado

• Colorado Department of Wildlife is concerned about impacts to big game species and habitat.

• Concern about the proposed corridor affecting mule deer winter habitat near Maybell, Colorado. (Map ID: A-131: Map Coordinates: H-4)

• All corridor alternatives impact important winter habitat for pronghorn, mule deer, and elk.

• During construction, direct disturbance or habitat fragmentation impacts to wildlife, particularly burrowing species, could occur.

• Colorado Department of Wildlife is concerned about potential overall project impacts to wildlife species throughout northwest Colorado, as the project is so large, it would be difficult to avoid sensitive habitats.

• All the corridor alternatives cross crucial winter range for mule deer and pronghorn.

• The EIS should describe the current capacity of habitat usage by wildlife affected in the Affected Environment.

• Corridor alternatives could impact crucial spring habitat for pronghorn.

• Concerns about impacts to elk winter range in the corridor alternative that crosses Elk Springs. (Map ID: A-132: Map Coordinates: G-4)

• The alternative corridor south of Rangely could potentially impact sensitive wildlife.

Utah

• Concern about impacts to bighorn sheep in the Mexican Mountain Wilderness Area. (Map ID: A-133: Map Coordinates: D-7)

• The proposed project could impact wildlife habitat with the increased human activity.
• Recommends using the Utah FO Guidelines for Raptor Protection for compliance with environmental laws.

• Potential project impacts to migratory birds should be mitigated as recommended by the USFWS.

**Wyoming**

• Concern about elk, pronghorn, mule deer, bear, turkey, blue grouse, and sage-grouse in the Baggs and Laramie Peak areas. *(Map ID: A-134: Map Coordinates: I-3)*

• The most eastern corridor alternative in Wyoming could impact big game migration routes, as well as raptor and bat habitat. *(Map ID: A-135: Map Coordinates: H-2)*

• The EIS should discuss the potential for electrocution and collision of raptors.

• Construction workers/employees should be dismissed for any poaching or harassing of wildlife.

• The proposed project is within suitable habitat for the northern leopard frog.

• To minimize impacts to migratory birds, the EIS should focus on species and areas from the USFWS’ 2008 list and those identified by the Intermountain West Joint Venture.

• The EIS should discuss important habitat loss and include the appropriate mitigation.

• Commenter notes that the alternative corridors should avoid high density prairie rattlesnakes near Baggs, Wyoming. *(Map ID: A-136: Map Coordinates: I-3)*

• Recommends the corridor alternatives avoid impacts to herptiles.

**Transportation**

• Access roads within the Fishlake National Forest will require changes to the Forest Service Travel Management Plan. *(Map ID: A-137: Map Coordinates: B-7, A-6)*
Region B – Intermountain Power Project to Las Vegas
Agriculture

- Concerns about the effects of direct current to pivot irrigation and cattle.
- Suggests siting transmission lines alongside existing lines to avoid conflicts with agricultural activities.

Corridor Alternatives

Utah

- Suggests a corridor alternative north of Delta and west into Nevada. (Map ID: B-1; Map Coordinates: H-1)
- Opposed to the proposed corridor crossing the Mountain Meadows Massacre Valley near Central, Utah. (Map ID: B-2; Map Coordinates: F-5)
- Proposed corridor through Iron County is acceptable and will have the least impacts. (Map ID: B-3; Map Coordinates: F-4)
- The corridor alternatives should be routed west of Washington County in Utah into less populated areas of Nevada. (Map ID: B-4; Map Coordinates: F-5)
- Requests that the project stay east of agricultural area and residents near New Castle. (Map ID: B-5; Map Coordinates: F-5)
- Concerns regarding separation of several transmission lines between Milford and Central, Utah; recommends this alternative be eliminated. (Map ID: B-6; Map Coordinates: G-4)
- Opposes western route in Utah because it would impact cultural resources near Crystal Peak the coast-to-coast, non-motorized American Discovery Trail. (Map ID: B-7; Map Coordinates: F-2)
- Opposed to the corridor alternative that branches off of the preferred route near the north end of Iron County due to sensitive resources and impacts to multiple-use lands. (Map ID: B-8; Map Coordinates: F-4)
- The corridor alternative that follows Millard County’s designated Major Utility Corridor and the West-Wide Energy Corridor (WWEC) corridor would impact Magnum’s development plans. (Map ID: B-9; Map Coordinates: G-2)
- Concern about impacts of the proposed corridor on Holt Canyon and Mountain Meadows Valley. (Map ID: B-10; Map Coordinates: F-5)
- Residents of Central, Utah, would prefer the alternative corridor through eastern Nevada to avoid neighborhoods in Central, impacts to the Kane Springs Aquifer, and Mountain Meadows Massacre site. (Map ID: B-11; Map Coordinates: F-5)

Nevada

- Supports the proposed corridor along I-15. (Map ID: B-12; Map Coordinates: D-7)
- Recommends not routing in overused transmission corridors and prefers the alternative corridor through Lincoln County. (Map ID: B-13; Map Coordinates: E-5)
- The northern corridor alternative south of the Great Basin National Park would impact protected species and result in visual impacts in sight of the park. (Map ID: B-14; Map Coordinates: E-2)
- The western corridor alternative is located within an already congested corridor and could impact the National Wildlife Refuge. (Map ID: B-15; Map Coordinates: D-6)
- Prefers the far western alternative in Nevada because it avoids the Mountain Meadows Massacre Valley and the Dixie National Forest. (Map ID: B-16; Map Coordinates: C-6)
• Suggests using the western route in the Mormon Mesa-to-Moapa area to avoid impacts to the Salt Lake-to-Southern California road routes. (Map ID: B-17; Map Coordinates: D-7)

• Prefers a corridor alternative from Lyndal, Utah, to follow the Intermountain Power Project Line to Las Vegas. (Map ID: B-18; Map Coordinates: E-6)

• Prefers an alternative corridor that follows the utility corridor through Dry Lake Valley. (Map ID: B-19; Map Coordinates: D-5)

• Project corridors should avoid the Valley of Fire State Park, the Logandale Trails, and the Red Rocks area. (Map ID: B-20; Map Coordinates: D-7)

Cultural Resources

Utah

• Mountain Meadows is a National Historic Landmark and all corridor alternatives should avoid the site. (Map ID: B-21; Map Coordinates: F-5)

• Construction of the transmission line could impact burial sites at the Mountain Meadows Massacre site; in the northern area are women and children burial sites, further south are the men’s burial site, and to the south is the view area and burial monument. (Map ID: B-22; Map Coordinates: F-5)

• The northern, western corridor alternative towards Nevada should be avoided to reduce potential impacts to Crystal Peak sacred sites. (Map ID: B-23; Map Coordinates: F-2)

• The National Insulator Association is interested in locating the original transcontinental telegraph route and is concerned that transmission line construction could change/destroy important historical evidence.

• Corridor alternatives should avoid the Central Utah Relocation Authority/Topaz Internment Camp National Historic Landmark north of Delta, Utah. (Map ID: B-24; Map Coordinates: H-1)

• The Western Shoshone has concerns about the corridor alternative in northeastern Millard County and Delta County. This area is traditional Western Shoshone Homelands with significant ties to the area. The Western Shoshone would like their traditional and culturally knowledgeable people from the tribe to be involved in any surveys of this area. (Map ID: B-25; Map Coordinates: H-1)

• Concerned about project impacts to the historic Old Spanish Trail in southwestern Utah. (Map ID: B-26; Map Coordinates: F-5)

Nevada

• Concerned about project development that deviates from the WWEC corridors and the impacts to cultural resources around the Old Spanish Trail. (Map ID: B-27; Map Coordinates: F-5)

• Suggests using the far western corridor alternative from Mormon Mesa to Moapa to avoid impacts to the Salt Lake-to-Southern California road route.

• Concerns about impacts to property owned by Wild Mustang Association with cultural issues along waterway.

Cumulative Impacts

• Commenter notes that the westernmost corridor alternative in Nevada would be adjacent to or within the same ROW as the proposed Southern Nevada Water Authority (SNWA) Groundwater Development Project (Nevada). (Map ID: B-28; Map Coordinates: D-6)

• Question about whether the TWE Project could interconnect with the Amargosa Solar Project (Nevada).
• Concerns about existing infrastructure within the proposed corridor through Central, Utah; in particular an existing gas line and a proposed new gas line (Utah). (Map ID: B-29; Map Coordinates: F-5)

Engineering and Design
• Concerns regarding congestion with multiple lines at the Clover Substation in Utah and the ability to maintain minimum line separation in the Milford to Central, Utah, area. (Map ID: B-30; Map Coordinates: H-1)
• Concern about electromagnetic fields interfering with radio emergency notifications.
• Recommends a different structure type – commenter brought a picture of a cow stuck in the same type of structure that the TWE Project is proposing. Also, lattice structure design provides perching for raptors.
• Concerns about the new line crossing over so many existing lines in the Red Butte substation area. (Map ID: B-31; Map Coordinates: F-5)
• Consideration should be given to tower placement and any aviation operations.

Fire Management
• Co-locating the transmission line with gas pipeline could create fire fighting difficulty (Central, Utah). (Map ID: B-32; Map Coordinates: F-5)
• Prefers corridor alternative west of Delta, Utah, to reduce the risk for fire fighters. (Map ID: B-33; Map Coordinates: G-1)
• Northwest Special Service District (Washington County, Utah Fire District) has concerns about siting the transmission line in southern Utah because the project would inhibit their ability to provide adequate air operations in the event of wildland fires. (Map ID: B-34; Map Coordinates: F-5)
• Fire fighter is concerned about electrocution should a fire start near the transmission line.

Lands and Realty
Nevada
• Concerned that routing through the Army National Guard property will render the land unusable for troop training.
• Lincoln County, Nevada, recommends the corridor alternative instead of using the existing overused transmission line corridors. (Map ID: B-35; Map Coordinates: D-5)
• A master planned residential and commercial community develop has been proposed for the area within the corridor near Glendale, Nevada. The development already has partial approvals and project development could cause the development to fail. (Map ID: B-36; Map Coordinates: D-7)
• Project corridors could impact a landfill site expansion north of Crestline, Nevada. (Map ID: B-37; Map Coordinates: E-5)
• Concerns about the proximity of the alternative corridors to a 10,000-foot-long runway located in the southwest corner of White Pine County.

Utah
• Corridors that cross State Institutional Lands could impact Magnum and School and Institution Trust Lands Administration’s development opportunities. (Map ID: B-38; Map Coordinates: H-1)
• Concerned about the proposed corridor’s potential impact to a gas storage project and future development plans involving 12,000 acres of private, federal, and Utah School and Institution Trust Lands. (Map ID: B-39; Map Coordinates: H-1)
• Proposed corridor should avoid area north of Delta, Utah, where a salt dome excavation area is planned. (Map ID: B-40; Map Coordinates: H-1)

Livestock Grazing
• Concerns about corridor alternatives through undeveloped WWEC corridors could impact grazing (Nevada).
• Prefers the I-15 corridor in Nevada because would not impact grazing.
• The Lincoln County, Nevada Planning Department has resource concerns about project corridor alternatives and their effects to grazing.
• Additional power lines north of the Mountain Meadows Massacre site to the Nevada border could conflict with cattle operations (Utah). (Map ID: B-41; Map Coordinates: E-6)
• Concerns about potential access roads affecting cattle ponds and revegetation post construction (Utah).

NEPA Process
• Magnum Holdings, LLC requests to be included in all future scoping proceedings.
• Need to expedite the EIS process for economic reasons and timely expansion of the western electric grid.
• Nevada Department of Wildlife wants continued participation in the EIS process, providing input on wildlife and habitat issues.

Opinion
• Lincoln County Planning Department supports the proposed corridor alternative.
• Strong opposition to the proposed corridor crossing the Mountain Meadows Massacre site. (Map ID: B-42; Map Coordinates: F-5)
• Supports the direct current transmission system because it has less energy loss, fewer substations, and a smaller footprint.
• Lincoln County Commissioners prefer the alternative corridor through their county, versus the proposed corridor. (Map ID: B-43; Map Coordinates: D-4)

Permitting
Nevada
• Any power line crossings of Nevada Department of Transportation ROWs will requirement an encroachment permit through District I and/or District III.
• No surface or groundwater can be used without having a permit issued or a waiver granted by the Nevada Department of Water Resources; artesian water must be controlled as required by Nevada code.
• Water wells, monitoring wells, or bore holes are the responsibility of the drilling entity and must be plugged and abandoned according to Nevada Administrative Code.
• Lincoln County, Nevada will require a Special Use Permit for project construction within the county and request discussion about the Construction, Operation, and Management Plan.
Utah

- Work camps must be permitted through a Conditional Use Permit.
- TWE must coordinate with Iron County Building Inspection Office about any permits.

Proposed Action

- Landowners oppose the proposed corridor through Central, Utah. (Map ID: B-44; Map Coordinates: F-5)

Public Health and Safety

Nevada

- Concerned about transmission line tower placement and safety for aviation operations.

Utah

- Residents of Central, Utah are concerned about their personal property and public safety related to a new transmission line and potential earthquakes, fire, and terrorists. (Map ID: B-45; Map Coordinates: F-5)
- Homes in the area are vulnerable to fire and the new transmission line poses a concern.
- Public safety concerns regarding co-location with existing gas lines in Central, Utah. (Map ID: B-46; Map Coordinates: F-5)
- Landowner concerns about the dangers of having a transmission line over their house.
- Concerns about fugitive dust and its effects on public health.

Public Involvement

- Requests that all residents of Central, Utah (zip code 84772) be added to the project mailing list.
- Requests a public meeting at Garrison or EskDale, Utah, or Baker, Nevada, if the western alternative corridor in the Delta-Milford, Utah, area is carried forward in the EIS.
- Unclear information regarding the public scoping meeting in Central, Utah.
- The City of Enterprise, Utah, represents a number of interests and would like to be involved in all steps of the TWE planning process.
- The Mountain Meadows Monument Foundation, Inc. is interested in participating in the Section 106 process.
- If the far western Nevada corridor alternative is selected, TWE and SNWA will need to coordinate on ROW.

Purpose and Need

- There is not a demonstrated need for this project and all of the corridor alternatives in Nevada are problematic.
- Support for the TWE Project and the resulting benefits to the western power grid and economy.

Recreation

- Project is too close to Logandale and could affect a large part of the off-road recreation area (Nevada). (Map ID: B-47; Map Coordinates: D-7)
- Concerns about the western alternative in Utah and the potential impacts to the non-motorized American Discovery Trail near Crystal Peak (Utah). (Map ID: B-48; Map Coordinates: F-2)
• Concerns about project impacts to the Valley of Fire and Logandale Trails recreation area (Nevada). (Map ID: B-49; Map Coordinates: D-7)

Socioeconomics

• The proposed project will accelerate the already declining property devaluation (Utah).
• The proposed project offers no economic benefit to Enterprise or Washington County, Utah. (Map ID: B-50; Map Coordinates: F-5)
• An increase in tax revenues will be important for Beaver County, Utah.
• Opposed to tax abatements for this project (Nevada).

Soils

• Concerned that the proposed project could degrade soil resources during construction of access roads.

Special Designated Lands

Nevada

• Concerned about corridor alternatives and their effect on the Mormon Mesa ACEC. (Map ID: B-51; Map Coordinates: E-6)
• The proposed corridor crossing the Sunrise Mountain Instant WSA and the Rainbow Gardens ACEC will be a barrier to approvals and construction.
• The western-most corridor alternative could impact the National Wildlife Refuge. (Map ID: B-52; Map Coordinates: D-6)
• Concern about the northern corridor alternative in western Utah because of potential visual impacts to the Great Basin National Park. (Map ID: B-53; Map Coordinates: E-2)
• Corridor alternatives should avoid the Tule Springs area northwest of Las Vegas.
• Concern about corridor alternative impacts to the Bowman Reservoir, the Valley of Fire State Park, and several Red Rock areas.

Utah

• The proposed corridor through Utah clips U.S. Forest Service roadless areas and Citizen Proposed Wilderness Areas.
• The proposed corridor crosses the Mountain Meadows Massacre Valley, which has been granted National Historic Landmark status and is on the National List of Historic Places. (Map ID: B-54; Map Coordinates: F-5)
• Concern about the northern corridor alternative in western Utah because of potential impacts to the Wah Wah WSA. (Map ID: B-55; Map Coordinates: F-2)

Special Status Species

Nevada

• All of the corridor alternatives impact habitats of BLM sensitive species.
• Concerned about impacts to sage-grouse habitat on the corridor alternative south of the Great Basin National Park. (Map ID: B-56; Map Coordinates: E-2)
• The north-south alternative corridor parallel to the Utah border will have potential impacts to rare wildlife and plant species. (Map ID: B-57; Map Coordinates: E-5)
• The alternative corridors in Nevada will impact the desert tortoise and its habitat.

**Utah**

• Concerned about impacts to the desert tortoise and its habitat in Washington County. (Map ID: B-58; Map Coordinates: F-5)
• Concerned about project impacts to the Columbia spotted frog, which is a Conservation Species and state sensitive species in Utah.
• The USFWS expressed concern about three new candidate plant species, Frisco clover (*Trifolium friscanum*), Ostler’s peppergrass (*Lepidium ostleri*) and Frisco buckwheat (*Eriogonum soredium*) that could potentially be affected by the proposed project in southwestern Utah.

**System Alternatives**

• Would not support changes from DC to AC, or changes to the energy source.

**Transportation and Access**

• Concern about the westernmost corridor alternative because of poor and frequently impassable roads (Nevada).
• Concerns about increase in construction traffic and additional access roads.
• Commenter notes that the project would not be able to use Frontier Road (Central, Utah area), because of U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s concern about fugitive dust. (Map ID: B-59; Map Coordinates: B-6)
• Concerns about additional traffic and public access on maintenance roads in the Central, Utah, area. (Map ID: B-60; Map Coordinates: F-5)

**Vegetation** (also see Special Status Species)

• Concerns about project impacts to water resources and riparian vegetation (Utah).
• Landowner expressed concern about tree removal along the proposed corridor (Utah).

**Visual Resources**

**Nevada**

• The northern corridor alternative in Nevada will impact visual landscapes of the Great Basin National Park. (Map ID: B-61; Map Coordinates: E-2)
• Concerned about visual impacts to visitors of the Valley of Fire State Park and the Logandale Trails. (Map ID: B-62; Map Coordinates: D-7)
• Concerned about light pollution effects to “dark skies” resulting from project construction.
• Concerns about visual impacts to the Red Cliffs area. (Map ID: B-63; Map Coordinates: F-6)

**Utah**

• Concerned about the proposed project leaving an “ugly scar” on the landscape.
• The proposed alternative will degrade the viewshed of Mountain Meadow Massacre Valley. (Map ID: B-64; Map Coordinates: F-5)
• Landowners in Central, Utah, are concerned about the visual impacts associated with the proposed project. (Map ID: B-65; Map Coordinates: F-5)
• The proposed project should not be located within Pine Valley; concerned about degrading the town’s beauty and landscape.

Water Resources
• Residents of Central, Utah, are concerned about impacts to water sources (springs, natural springs, runoff, and tributaries). (Map ID: B-66; Map Coordinates: F-5)
• Concern about erecting transmission line structures and foundation over the Kane Springs Aquifer, which is the sole water source for Central, Utah. Suggests proposed corridor be sited to the west of Central. (Map ID: B-67; Map Coordinates: F-5)

Wildlife (also see Special Status Species)
• Overall, the proposed project could harm sensitive wildlife habitat.
• Concerned about project corridor impacts to mule deer, elk, and pronghorn populations in winter habitat (Utah).
• Residents in Central, Utah, are concerned about long-term impacts to wildlife and habitat fragmentation and species displacement. (Map ID: B-68; Map Coordinates: F-5)
• Commenter sees no impacts resulting from transmission line construction to coyotes and rabbits in the Milford, Utah, area. (Map ID: B-69; Map Coordinates: G-3)
• Potential project impacts to migratory birds should be mitigated as recommended by the USFWS.
Region C – Las Vegas to Marketplace
Air Quality

- Proposed project will be subject to Clark County Air Quality Regulations and enforced by Clark County Department of Air Quality and Environmental Management Program.
- Fugitive dust resulting from project construction is subject to Sections 90-94 (Air Quality Regulations). A Dust Control Permit will be required.
- The EIS should discuss and disclose any use of sulfur hexafluoride (SF6) and ensure that mitigation measures are in place to manage any impacts from SF6.

Aquatic Resources

- The proposed project must develop a Fish Protection Plan to ensure no harm is done to rare fish as a result of project development.

Corridor Alternatives

- Corridor alternatives should avoid the Sunrise Wilderness Instant Study Area because routing a transmission line through an area with this designation will require an Act of Congress. (Map ID: C-1; Map Coordinates: G-3)
- Numerous landowner opposition comments to the corridor alternative crossing Lake Las Vegas, Calico Ridge Subdivision, and east of Henderson, Nevada. (Map ID: C-2; Map Coordinates: G-4)
- Strong recommendation from landowners in Henderson, Nevada, to route the line east of the existing line in the River Mountains Range. (Map ID: C-3; Map Coordinates: G-5)
- Corridor alternatives should follow existing transmission line corridors.
- Supports the proposed corridor that follows the existing transmission lines through the Hoover Dam area. (Map ID: C-4; Map Coordinates: H-5)
- Opposes the corridor alternative on the west that crosses the Red Rocks Natural Area Conservation (NCA). (Map ID: C-5; Map Coordinates: C-3)
- The BLM Las Vegas FO requests that the Southern Nevada District Office RMP utility corridor west of I-15 be considered as an alternative corridor for the EIS. (Map ID: C-6; Map Coordinates: G-1)
- Concerns about the proposed corridor that parallels existing transmission lines on the east side because of potential impacts to the Clark County Wetlands Park. (Map ID: C-7; Map Coordinates: G-4)
- The National Park Service opposes any corridor alternative that crosses the Lake Mead Recreation Area. (Map ID: C-8; Map Coordinates: G-3)
- Concerns about the east-west corridor alternative that could potentially impact the sensitive species and the Nellis Air Force Base Small Arms Range. (Map ID: C-9; Map Coordinates: F-2)
- Concerns about impacts to military operations in the Low Altitude Tactical Navigation airspace, Nellis Air Force Base, and the Nevada Test and Training Range. (Map ID: C-10; Map Coordinates: F-2)
- The proposed corridor intersects the industrial area of Apex, Park Highlands Master Planned Community, the planned University of Nevada Las Vegas campus, the Upper Las Vegas Wash Conservation Transfer Area, and an area that is under consideration for National Park Unit designation. The EIS needs to address potential impacts to these land uses. (Map ID: C-11; Map Coordinates: E-2, G-2, D-1)
Cultural Resources

- Concerns about project development affecting Tule Springs, which has the potential of becoming a National Monument. (Map ID: C-12; Map Coordinates: D-1)

- An additional corridor through the Lake Mead Recreation Area is contrary to the legislation that the park operates under and contrary to natural and cultural resources the park is protecting. (Map ID: C-13; Map Coordinates: G-3)

Cumulative Impacts

- Commenter is concerned about the cumulative visual impacts, especially to dark sky attributes.
- The proposed project will need to be compatible with the SNWA proposals in the area.
- Portions of the proposed and alternative corridors overlap with the Eastern Nevada Transmission Project; TWE needs to coordinate with this project. (Map ID: C-14; Map Coordinates: G-2)
- All cumulative impacts on existing, planned, and foreseeable developments should be evaluated in the EIS.
- Concerned about the cumulative effects of multiple transmission lines, dust from construction causing visual distractions, the use of helicopters during line construction, and degradation to aircraft radar and flight control instruments. Structures should be lighted, marked, and charted on Federal Aviation Administration flight sections, maps, and other appropriate navigation references.

Engineering and Design

- Concern about arcing or sparking from the transmission lines that could cause a fire.
- Concern about lines breaking and falling on homes.
- Questions about the effects of stray voltage to satellite dishes, cell phones, landlines, and TV reception.
- Requests that transmission lines be buried or that a route is selected closer to the existing transmission lines along the hilltops.
- Question about the review process for issue of restricted width of the Henderson Corridor.
- Tubular structures should be used to prevent raptor and corvid perching because they prey on some special status species.
- Commenter questions the ability to maintain a 1,500-foot separation from other high voltage lines, yet still remain within the corridor.
- Transmission infrastructure near the Nevada Test and Training Range may impact military operations, but could be mitigated by using steel pole structures. (Map ID: C-15; Map Coordinates: F-2)

Geology

- Concerns about potential impacts to significant geological resources in Tule Springs. (Map ID: C-16; Map Coordinates: D-1)

Lands and Realty

- Corridor alternatives should not be placed on the west side of the Las Vegas Valley because of potential future development near Kyle Canyon Road and Highway 95. (Map ID: C-17; Map Coordinates: D-1)
Project development should occur on BLM land on the east side of the Las Vegas Valley because of transmission line congestion on the west side of valley. (Map ID: C-18; Map Coordinates: G-4)

The proposed TWE Project will decrease property values.

The proposed project is incompatible with rural zoning and incompatible with wildlife, canyons, and trails.
  - Industrial area of Apex
  - Park Highlands Master Planned Community
  - Planned University of Nevada Las Vegas campus
  - Upper Las Vegas Wash Conservation Transfer Area
  - An area that is under consideration for National Park designation

The EIS needs to address impacts to these future land uses.

The corridor alternative on the west side of the Las Vegas Valley would impact Lone Mountain, Summerlin South, and the South County Planning Areas. (Map ID: C-19; Map Coordinates: C-3)

Alternative corridors could impact multiple operations associated with the Nellis Air Force Base including Low Altitude Tactical Navigation airspace and emergency aircraft evacuation/ejection areas. (Map ID: C-20; Map Coordinates: F-2)

Transmission infrastructure near the Nevada Test and Training Range may impact military operations.

Concerns about impacts to a new equestrian park, a dog park, and hiking and biking trails within corridor alternatives on the west side of the valley. (Map ID: C-21; Map Coordinates: G-4)

Residents in eastern Henderson are concerned about the impacts (e.g., property values, health and safety) associated with an additional line in their area. (Map ID: C-22; Map Coordinates: G-4)

Livestock Grazing

All corridor alternatives within the Las Vegas Valley could potentially impact ranches.

Mitigation/Reclamation (also see Air Quality, Special Status Species, and Wildlife)

The proposed project must use consistent lighting mitigation including mitigation measures such as screening and landscape paint colors.

NEPA Process

The proposed corridor crossing the Sunrise Wilderness Instant Study Area would require an Act of Congress; therefore, it is recommended the proposed corridor be routed around this area. (Map ID: C-23; Map Coordinates: G-3)

Because of the alternative corridor’s proximity to the Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument, impacts to this area should be evaluated in the EIS. (Map ID: C-24; Map Coordinates: D-1)

The proposed project will require a comprehensive monitoring and cultural resources discovery plan; the plan needs to be available for public review and attached to project NEPA documents.
Noise

- Concerned about the “humming” noise from the transmission line and impacts to riders who use the equestrian trail.

Opinion

- Numerous landowners oppose the proposed corridor near Henderson, Nevada, including the River Mountain area. (Map ID: C-25; Map Coordinates: G-4)
- The proposed project will impact North Las Vegas. (Map ID: C-26; Map Coordinates: E-2)
- It is not acceptable to build a transmission line project so close to homes when there are other alternatives.
- Opposed to any corridor alternative that crosses through the Lake Las Vegas/Calico Ridge area. (Map ID: C-27; Map Coordinates: G-4)
- Supports the project and would like to see the project permitted as soon as possible.

Paleontological Resources

- Concern about impacts to fossil resources in the upper Las Vegas Wash.
- Project development could impact fossils in the Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument. (Map ID: C-28; Map Coordinates: D-1)

Permitting

- No use of surface water or groundwater will occur until a permit is issued or a waiver is granted by the Nevada Department of Water Resources.
- Any crossings of the Nevada Department of Transportation will require an encroachment permit through District I and/or District III.
- Water wells, monitoring wells, or bore holes must be plugged and abandoned according to Nevada Administrative Code.
- Project will be subject to Clark County Air Quality Regulations and enforced by Clark County Department of Air Quality and Environmental Management Air Program.
- A Dust Control Permit will be required for construction activities.

Public Health and Safety

- Landowner concerns about the potential for sabotage.
- Arcing and sparking from the transmission lines could cause fire risk.
- Concern about electromagnetic fields and their effects on human health.
- Additional transmission line towers in the area will result in health and safety concerns when conducting low-level aerial operations.
- Falling towers and snapped lines could impact homes and residents using horse and bike trails.
- Dust, wind, and rain could cause sparking and arcing with the potential to deliver shock or serious injury.
- Risk of danger for those who trespass.

Public Involvement

- Future notices about the proposed project should be provided to the entire River Mountain neighborhood and the River Mountains Trail Partnership Advisory Council.
• Many residents were not notified about the public meetings.
• Some scoping meeting attendees were given conflicting information.
• Scoping attendees commented that they benefited from the scoping meeting held in Henderson, Nevada.

Recreation
• The proposed corridor crosses the River Mountains Trail Loop and will impact users of the trail (Nevada). (Map ID: C-29; Map Coordinates: G-5)

Socioeconomics
• Numerous landowner concerns about devalued property in the Henderson and Kyle Canyon area. (Map ID: C-30; Map Coordinates: G-4, D-1)

Special Designation Areas
• Concerns about impacts to special designation areas in the Las Vegas Valley include: (Map ID: C-31; Map Coordinates: G-5, G-3, F-2, D-1, E-1)
  − Sunrise Instant Study Area
  − River Mountain Loop Trails
  − Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument
  − Desert Wildlife Refuge (north and northwest of Las Vegas)
  − Lake Mead National Recreation Area
  − Nellis Air Force Base
  − Red Rock NCA
• The National Park Service will not authorize any project corridor through the Lake Mead Recreation Area; the project does not conform to the General Management Plan for the Lake Mead Recreation Area (Nevada). (Map ID: C-32; Map Coordinates: G-3)

Special Status Species
• Concern about impacts to special status wildlife species and unique and rare vegetation in the potential National Monument at Tule Springs. (Map ID: C-33; Map Coordinates: D-1)
• Concerned about impacts to important rare wildlife and plant habitat on the east-west alternative corridor north of Las Vegas. (Map ID: C-34; Map Coordinates: E-2)
• Potential impacts to rare vegetation and wildlife in the corridor alternative that crosses the Lake Mead Recreation Area. (Map ID: C-35; Map Coordinates: G-3)
• Concerns about project corridor impacts to the Las Vegas buckwheat, sticky wild buckwheat, sticky ringstem, Las Vegas bearpoppy, and the three-cornered milkvetch.
• Concerns about impacts to the desert tortoise and tortoise habitat; transmission lines should be placed as close as possible to existing lines and designed to discourage perching.

Transportation and Access
• Project corridor alternatives should consider and maintain access for SNWA groundwater monitoring.

Vegetation (also see Special Status Species)
• The proposed project should parallel existing transmission lines and not harm virgin habitat.
Visual Resources

- The proposed project will impact views of the River Mountains Range. (Map ID: C-36; Map Coordinates: G-5)
- Concerned about visual impacts in the corridor alternative that crosses the Red Rocks NCA. (Map ID: C-37; Map Coordinates: C-3)
- Multiple landowner concerns about transmission line construction and the resulting impacts to visual resources.

Water Resources

- Concerns about the potential impacts to the National Monument at Tule Springs as the springs are important to the southern Nevada watershed. (Map ID: C-38; Map Coordinates: D-1)

Wildlife (also see Special Status Species)

- Concerns about bird mortality caused by power line collisions.
- The proposed corridor that crosses the River Mountains Range could impact desert bighorn sheep habitat and breeding areas. (Map ID: C-39; Map Coordinates: G-5)
- Pre-construction surveys should be required for rare invertebrates.
The alternative segments shown on this map are preliminary and may be revised and/or refined throughout the development of the project.
Appendix B
Notification
quarter of the Northeast quarter of said Section 8; thence South 191.0 feet; thence East 228.0 feet; thence North 191.0 feet; thence West 228.0 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Except that portion of said premises, described as follows:

Beginning at a point 390.0 feet East of the Northwest corner of said Northeast quarter of the Northeast quarter of said Section 8; thence East 206.00 feet; thence South 206.0 feet; thence West 206.0 feet; thence North 206.0 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Except that portion of said premises lying within County Road No. 25:

Except that portion conveyed to the State of Washington by deed recorded under Auditor’s File Nos. G 499101, and G 499102.

Except that portion conveyed to the State of Washington for Interstate 5.

Except that portion conveyed to James Fisher and wife, by instrument recorded under Auditor’s File No. G 699690, described as follows:

Beginning at the Southeast corner of the Northeast quarter of the Northeast quarter of Section 8, Township 4 North, Range 1 East of the Willamette Meridian, Clark County, Washington; thence North 200 feet; thence West 435 feet; thence South 200 feet to a point on the South line of the Northeast quarter of the Northeast quarter of said Section; thence East 435 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Parcel IX

That portion of the Northeast quarter of the Northeast quarter of Section 8, Township 4 North, Range 1 East of the Willamette Meridian, Clark County, Washington; described as follows:

Beginning at a point 612 feet East of the Northwest corner of the Northeast quarter of the Northeast quarter of Section 8, Township 4 North, Range 1 East of the Willamette Meridian, Clark County, Washington; thence South 191 feet; thence East 228 feet; thence North 191 feet; thence West 228 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Except County Roads.

Also except that portion thereof conveyed to the State of Washington by deed recorded under Auditor’s File Nos. G 500929 and G 143551.

Dated: December 17, 2010.

Larry Echo Hawk,
Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs.
Because of the congestion in the Las Vegas, Nevada area an alternative may be considered that would require a National Park Service (NPS) Management Plan amendment to implement. As required by 43 CFR 1610.2(c), the BLM notifies the public of potential amendments to RMPs and, pursuant to 36 CFR 219.9, the USFS notifies the public of potential amendments to LMPs. Any authorizations and actions proposed for approval in the EIS will be evaluated to determine if they conform to the decisions in the referenced land use plans. If amendments are needed, the BLM and the USFS would integrate the land-use planning process as described in 43 CFR part 1610 and 36 CFR 219.8, respectively, with this EIS process as they proceed with NEPA compliance for the proposed Project. If the BLM or the USFS determine that plan amendments are necessary, compliance with NEPA for any land use plan amendments would occur simultaneously with the consideration of the Project.

The BLM plans that may be amended include those portions of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, the Rawlins RMP, the Rock Springs RMP, the Kemmerer RMP, the Grand Junction RMP, the Glenwood Springs RMP, the Little Snake RMP, the White River RMP, the Cedar-Beaver-Garfield-Antimony RMP, the House Range RMP, the Warm Springs RMP, the Kanab RMP, the Moab RMP, the Price RMP, the Richfield RMP, the St. George RMP, the Vernal RMP, the Beaver Dam Wash Area of Critical Environmental Concern RMP, the Ely RMP, the Carlin RMP, and the Las Vegas RMP. The USFS Plans that may be amended include the Ashley National Forest Plan, the White River National Forest Revised Plan, the Dixie National Forest Plan, the Fishlake National Forest Plan, the Manti-La Sal National Forest Plan, the Uinta National Forest Plan, the Humboldt National Forest Plan, and the Toiyabe National Forest Plan. The NPS Plan that may be considered for amendment is the Lake Mead National Recreation Area Lake Management Plan. Only the BLM may amend a BLM RMP, while the USFS may amend a Forest Plan; and only the NPS may amend a National Park Service Plan. The NPS is not a formal copraator in this EIS so any plan amendment process it may undertake would be considered separately.

A Programmatic EIS was prepared by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Energy for energy corridors in 11 western States and completed in January 2009. The Records of Decisions for this Project identified energy transmission corridors and provided guidance, best management practices, and mitigation measures to be used for any power lines proposed to be constructed within the corridors. The Project proposes to use the corridors identified in the ROD to the maximum extent possible. No BLM plan amendments will be needed if the right-of-way remains within designated corridors.

The BLM and Western are joint lead agencies for this EIS as defined at 40 CFR 1501.5. Agencies with jurisdiction by law or special expertise have been invited to participate as cooperating agencies in preparation of the EIS. The following agencies have agreed to participate as cooperating agencies: The USFS, Intermountain Region; the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers South Pacific Division; Reclamation, Lower Colorado Region; the U.S. Navy Region Southwest; the States of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and Nevada; Garfield, Mesa, Moffat, and Rio-Blanco counties in Colorado; Beaver, Duchesne, Emery, Juab, Millard, Piute, Sanpete, Uintah, Wasatch, and Washington counties in Utah; Lincoln and Clark counties in Nevada and the Little Snake River Conservation District, Medicine Bow Conservation District, Saratoga-Encampment-Rawlins Conservation District, and Sweetwater County Conservation District, Wyoming. The Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah, the Moapa Band of Paiute, and the Las Vegas Paiute Tribe are also cooperating agencies.

During the public scoping period, the BLM and Western will solicit public comments on behalf of all cooperating agencies regarding issues, concerns, and opportunities that should be considered in the analysis of the proposed action. Comments on issues and potential impacts, or suggestions for additional or different alternatives may be submitted to the addresses listed in the ADDRESSES section. Documents pertinent to the ROW application for the project may be examined at:

- BLM, Wyoming State Office, 5353 Yellowstone Road, Cheyenne, Wyoming 82009.
- BLM, Rawlins Field Office, 1300 N. Third Street, Rawlins, Wyoming 82301.
- BLM, Little Snake Field Office, 455 Emerson Street, Craig, Colorado 81625.
- BLM, Grand Junction Field Office, 2815 H Road, Grand Junction, Colorado 81506.
- BLM, Cedar City Field Office, 176 D.L. Sargent Drive, Cedar City, Utah 84721.
cooperating agencies, USFS and other cooperating agencies interested individuals or groups. The details and gather information from proponents will be available at the staff, Western staff, and Project during the scoping period. The BLM historic trails; wild and scenic rivers; visual intrusions; lands with wilderness (including special and sensitive status and safety; plant and animal species Socioeconomic impacts; public health issues that will be addressed in the EIS: preliminarily identified the following cooperators, and individuals have project are invited to participate in the interested or affected by the BLM, with other stakeholders that may be coordinate the NEPA commenting process to satisfy the public involvement process for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, 16 U.S.C. 470f, as provided for in 36 CFR 800.2(d)(3). Consultation with Native American Tribes will be conducted in accordance with applicable policies, and Tribal concerns, including impacts on Indian trust assets, will be given due consideration. Federal, State, and local agencies, along with other stakeholders that may be interested or affected by the BLM, USFS, or Western’s decisions on the project are invited to participate in the scoping process and, if eligible, may request or be requested by the BLM and Western to participate as a cooperating agency. Timothy J. Meeks, Administrator, Western Area Power Administration. Donald A. Simpson, Wyoming State Director, Bureau of Land Management.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (NEPA), and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, as amended (FLPMA), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) have prepared a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), and Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) as a joint environmental analysis document for the Iberdrola Renewable/Pacific Wind Development Tule Wind Project (Tule Project) and the San Diego Gas and Electric’s (SDG&E) East County Substation Project (ECO Project) and by this notice are announcing the opening of the comment period on the Draft EIS/EIR.

DATES: To ensure that your comments will be considered, the BLM must receive written comments on the Draft EIS/EIR by close of business on February 16, 2011. The comment period began on December 23, 2010, with publication of the Notice of Availability in the Federal Register by the Environmental Protection Agency. Recognizing that the public review period began during the holidays, the BLM has decided to extend the 45-day comment period cited in the EPA notice until close of business on February 16, 2011 (55 days total). The BLM and CPUC will hold two joint public informational workshop meetings on the projects; the first in Jacumba, at 7 p.m., on January 26, 2011, at the Jacumba Volunteer Fire Department at 39223 Highway 94, Boulevard, California 91934, and the second in Boulevard, at 7 p.m., on February 2, 2011, at the Boulevard Volunteer Fire Department at 39223 Highway 94, Boulevard, California 91905. The public will be notified in advance of any updates or changes to these public meetings through local media, newspapers and the BLM Web site at: http://www.blm.gov/ca/st/en/fo/elcentro.html.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments related to the Tule Wind Project and East County Substation Project by any of the following methods:

- E-mail: catulewind@blm.gov.
- Fax: (951) 697–5299.
- Mail: ATTN: Greg Thomesen, BLM California Desert District Office (CDDO), 22835 Calle San Juan de Los Lagos, Moreno Valley, California 92553–9046.

Copies of the EIS/EIR are available on the BLM Web site at: https://www.ca.blm.gov/elcentro and also from the CPUC and the CDDO at the above addresses and in the BLM El Centro

ADDITIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION UPON PUBLICATION OF THE DRAFT EIS:

Because the proposed Project may involve activities and construction in floodplains or wetlands, this NOI also serves as a notice of proposed floodplain or wetland action, in accordance with DOE regulations for Compliance with Floodplain and Wetlands Environmental Review Requirements, 10 CFR 1022.12(a). The EIS will include a floodplain/wetland assessment and, if required, a floodplain statement of findings will be issued with the Final EIS or in the RODs issued by Western, the BLM, and the USFS, if any.

The BLM and Western will use and coordinate the NEPA commenting process to satisfy the public involvement process for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, 16 U.S.C. 470f, as provided for in 36 CFR 800.2(d)(3). Consultation with Native American Tribes will be conducted in accordance with applicable policies, and Tribal concerns, including impacts on Indian trust assets, will be given due consideration. Federal, State, and local agencies, along with other stakeholders that may be interested or affected by the BLM, USFS, or Western’s decisions on the project are invited to participate in the scoping process and, if eligible, may request or be requested by the BLM and Western to participate as a cooperating agency.

Timothy J. Meeks,
Administrator, Western Area Power Administration.

Donald A. Simpson,
Wyoming State Director, Bureau of Land Management.

[FR Doc. 2010–33180 Filed 1–3–11; 8:45 am]
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Notice of Availability of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Iberdrola Renewable/Pacific Wind Development Tule Wind Project and San Diego Gas and Electric’s East County Substation Project, San Diego County, CA

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of Availability.
January 4, 2011
Contact: Beverly Gorny, 307-775-6158

BLM Seeks Public Input on Proposed TransWest Express Transmission Line Project in Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and Nevada

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the Western Area Power Administration (Western) are seeking public comment on an environmental impact statement (EIS) that will evaluate the potential impacts of constructing the TransWest Express 600-kilovolt (kV) direct current (DC) transmission line project, which is proposed to cross portions of Colorado, Nevada, Utah, and Wyoming. The project is proposed by TransWest Express, LLC, a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Anschutz Corporation. The BLM and Western are jointly leading the project. The announcement was published in the Federal Register on Jan. 4, and initiates a 90-day public scoping period.

TransWest Express, LLC, proposes to construct an extra-high-voltage overhead transmission line from south-central Wyoming through Utah and northwestern Colorado terminating at the Marketplace Hub in southern Nevada – a distance of about 725 miles. The project would also include two AC/DC converter stations, a fiber optic network communications system, and two ground electrode facilities. The proposed line would transmit up to 3,000 megawatts per year of electricity generated primarily from planned renewable energy facilities in Wyoming to respond to anticipated load growth in the southwestern United States. Alternative routes identified so far would affect federal, state, and private lands. Authorization of this proposal may result in the amendment of U.S. Forest Service (USFS) and BLM land and resource management plans.

The BLM and Western expect to host 23 open-house meetings at various locations in Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and Nevada along the proposed corridor to provide the public an opportunity to review the proposal and project information. Staff and project proponents will be available at each open house to explain project details and gather information from interested individuals or groups. Through the scoping process, the BLM and Western expect to gather public input on resources and issues that should be addressed in the EIS, including route alternatives that should be analyzed in detail in the EIS and sources of information that may be used in the environmental analysis. The USFS and other cooperating agencies are expected to participate in the public meetings. The exact dates, times and locations for these meetings will be announced at least 15 days prior to the event through local media, newspapers, and newsletters, and posting on the project Web site: http://www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/info/NEPA/HighDesert/transwest.html.

Comments may be made to the BLM and Western during the open house meetings, via the project e-mail address (TransWest_WYMail@blm.gov) or in writing to Bureau of Land
Management, Attention Sharon Knowlton, Project Manager, TransWest Express Project, P.O. Box 20578, 5353 Yellowstone Road, Cheyenne, Wyoming 82003. Facsimile comments will not be accepted. Project information and documents will be available on the project Web site: http://www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/info/NEPA/HighDesert/transwest.html. To ensure that written comments and information are fully considered during the preparation of the Draft EIS, the BLM must receive them by close of business on April 4, 2011. All comments and submissions will be considered in the environmental analysis process.

For further information or to have your name added to the mailing list, contact Sharon Knowlton, Project Manager, (307) 775-6124; or at the email or mailing address noted above.

BLM manages more land -- more than 245 million acres -- than any other Federal agency. This land, known as the National System of Public Lands, is primarily located in 12 Western states, including Alaska. The Bureau, with a budget of about $1 billion, also administers 700 million acres of sub-surface mineral estate throughout the nation. The BLM’s multiple-use mission is to sustain the health and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations. The Bureau accomplishes this by managing such activities as outdoor recreation, livestock grazing, mineral development, and energy production, and by conserving natural, historical, cultural, and other resources on public lands.

-BLM-
The Bureau of Land Management and Western Area Power Administration are hosting an open house, so the public can review the proposed TransWest Express Transmission Project.

Federal agencies and the project proponent, TransWest Express LLC, will share project information at the open house as part of the public scoping process. The public scoping process allows BLM and Western to gather input on resources, issues and information that may be used and addressed in the project's environmental analysis.
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Federal agencies and the project proponent, TransWest Express LLC, will share project information at the open house as part of the public scoping process. The public scoping process allows BLM and Western to gather input on resources, issues and information that may be used and addressed in the project's environmental analysis.
Federal agencies and the project proponent, TransWest Express LLC, will share project information at the open house as part of the public scoping process. The public scoping process allows BLM and Western to gather input on resources, issues and information that may be used and addressed in the project’s environmental analysis.

The TransWest Express Transmission Project is a high-voltage direct current transmission system designed to deliver renewable energy from central Wyoming to western power users. The proposed route crosses multiple counties in Wyoming, Colorado, Utah and Nevada. For more information about other scoping meetings visit: http://www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/info/NEPA/documents/hdd/transwest.html.
THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION ARE HOSTING PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS IN YOUR AREA.

TRANSWEST EXPRESS, LLC IS PROPOSING TO CONSTRUCT A 600-KV DC TRANSMISSION LINE FROM SOUTH CENTRAL WYOMING TO SOUTHERN NEVADA SOUTH OF LAS VEGAS. THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION WILL BE PREPARING AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.

YOU ARE INVITED TO ATTEND THE PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS TO LEARN MORE ABOUT THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND TO PROVIDE YOUR COMMENTS.

THE FOLLOWING PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS WILL BE HELD IN YOUR AREA:

TUESDAY, JANUARY 25, 2011
UINTAH HIGH SCHOOL
1880 WEST 500 NORTH
VERNAL, UTAH

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 26, 2011
MOFFATT COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT
ALL MEETINGS WILL BE HELD FROM 4 P.M. TO 7 P.M.

YOUR INPUT IS IMPORTANT. WE HOPE YOU WILL ATTEND TO PROVIDE YOUR INPUT ON THE PROPOSED TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT.

#####
The Bureau of Land Management and Western Area Power Administration are hosting public scoping meetings in your area.

Transwest Express, LLC is proposing to construct a 600-kV DC transmission line from south central Wyoming to southern Nevada south of Las Vegas. The Bureau of Land Management and Western Area Power Administration will be preparing an environmental impact statement.

You are invited to attend the public scoping meetings to learn more about the proposed project and to provide your comments.

The following public scoping meetings will be held in your area:

Monday, January 31, 2011
Central High School Library
550 Warrior Way
Grand Junction, Colorado
ALL MEETINGS WILL BE HELD FROM 4 P.M. TO 7 P.M.

YOUR INPUT IS IMPORTANT. WE HOPE YOU WILL ATTEND TO PROVIDE YOUR INPUT ON THE PROPOSED TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT.

#####
Public Scoping Meetings – As Recorded

THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION ARE HOSTING PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS IN YOUR AREA.

TRANSWEST EXPRESS, LLC IS PROPOSING TO CONSTRUCT A 600-KV DC TRANSMISSION LINE FROM SOUTH CENTRAL WYOMING TO SOUTHERN NEVADA SOUTH OF LAS VEGAS. THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION WILL BE PREPARING AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.

YOU ARE INVITED TO ATTEND THE PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS TO LEARN MORE ABOUT THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND TO PROVIDE YOUR COMMENTS.

THE FOLLOWING PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS WILL BE HELD IN YOUR AREA:

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2011
HELEN M. KNIGHT ELEMENTARY
505 N. MI VIDA
MOAB, UTAH

AND
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2011

CASTLE DALE ELEMENTARY

195 EAST, 600 NORTH

CASTLE DALE, UTAH

ALL MEETINGS WILL BE HELD FROM 4 P.M. TO 7 P.M.

YOUR INPUT IS IMPORTANT. WE HOPE YOU WILL ATTEND TO PROVIDE YOUR INPUT ON THE PROPOSED TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT.

###
THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION ARE HOSTING PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS IN YOUR AREA.

TRANSWEST EXPRESS, LLC IS PROPOSING TO CONSTRUCT A 600-KV DC TRANSMISSION LINE FROM SOUTH CENTRAL WYOMING TO SOUTHERN NEVADA SOUTH OF LAS VEGAS. THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION WILL BE PREPARING AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.

YOU ARE INVITED TO ATTEND THE PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS TO LEARN MORE ABOUT THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND TO PROVIDE YOUR COMMENTS.

THE FOLLOWING PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS WILL BE HELD IN YOUR AREA:

MONDAY, JANUARY 31, 2011
CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARY
550 WARRIOR WAY
GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2011
HELEN M. KNIGHT ELEMENTARY
505 N. MI VIDA
MOAB, UTAH

AND

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2011
CASTLE DALE ELEMENTARY
195 EAST, 600 NORTH
CASTLE DALE, UTAH

ALL MEETINGS WILL BE HELD FROM 4 P.M. TO 7 P.M.

YOUR INPUT IS IMPORTANT. WE HOPE YOU WILL ATTEND TO PROVIDE YOUR INPUT ON THE PROPOSED TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT.

####
The Bureau of Land Management and Western Area Power Administration are hosting public scoping meetings in your area.

Transwest Express, LLC is proposing to construct a 600-kv DC transmission line from South Central Wyoming to Southern Nevada south of Las Vegas. The Bureau of Land Management and Western Area Power Administration will be preparing an environmental impact statement.

You are invited to attend the public scoping meetings to learn more about the proposed project and to provide your comments.

The following public scoping meetings will be held in your area:

Monday, February 7, 2011
Duchesne High School
155 West Main Street
Duchesne, Utah
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2011
JUAB COUNTY COURTHOUSE
CULTURAL HALL
160 NORTH MAIN
NEPHI, UTAH

AND

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2011
MILLARD SCHOOL DISTRICT OFFICE
285 EAST 450 NORTH
DELTA, UTAH

ALL MEETINGS WILL BE HELD FROM 4 P.M. TO 7 P.M.

YOUR INPUT IS IMPORTANT. WE HOPE YOU WILL ATTEND TO PROVIDE YOUR INPUT ON THE PROPOSED TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT.

####
Bureau of Land Management
5353 Yellowstone Road
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82003

Western Area Power Administration
P.O. Box 281213
Lakewood, Colorado 80228-0213

Public Scoping Meetings – As Recorded

THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION ARE HOSTING PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS IN YOUR AREA.

TRANSWEST EXPRESS, LLC IS PROPOSING TO CONSTRUCT A 600-KV DC TRANSMISSION LINE FROM SOUTH CENTRAL WYOMING TO SOUTHERN NEVADA SOUTH OF LAS VEGAS. THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION WILL BE PREPARING AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.

YOU ARE INVITED TO ATTEND THE PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS TO LEARN MORE ABOUT THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND TO PROVIDE YOUR COMMENTS.

THE FOLLOWING PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS WILL BE HELD IN YOUR AREA:

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2011
DUCHESNE HIGH SCHOOL
155 WEST MAIN STREET
DUCHESNE, UTAH

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2011
JUAB COUNTY COURTHOUSE
CULTURAL HALL
160 NORTH MAIN
NEPHI, UTAH

AND

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2011
MILLER SCHOOL DISTRICT OFFICE
285 EAST 450 NORTH
DELTA, UTAH

ALL MEETINGS WILL BE HELD FROM 4 P.M. TO 7 P.M.

YOUR INPUT IS IMPORTANT. WE HOPE YOU WILL ATTEND TO PROVIDE YOUR INPUT ON THE PROPOSED TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT.

####
THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION ARE HOSTING PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS IN YOUR AREA.

TRANSWEST EXPRESS, LLC IS PROPOSING TO CONSTRUCT A 600-KV DC TRANSMISSION LINE FROM SOUTH CENTRAL WYOMING TO SOUTHERN NEVADA SOUTH OF LAS VEGAS. THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION WILL BE PREPARING AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.

YOU ARE INVITED TO ATTEND THE PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS TO LEARN MORE ABOUT THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND TO PROVIDE YOUR COMMENTS.

THE FOLLOWING PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS WILL BE HELD IN YOUR AREA:

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2011
RICHFIELD HIGH SCHOOL
510 WEST 100 SOUTH
RICHFIELD, UTAH
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2011
MILFORD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
450 SOUTH 700 WEST
MILFORD, UTAH

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2011
CEDAR CITY HIGH SCHOOL
703 WEST 600 SOUTH
CEDAR CITY, UTAH

AND

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2011
ST. GEORGE BRANCH WASHINGTON COUNTY LIBRARY
88 WEST 100 SOUTH
ST. GEORGE, UTAH

ALL MEETINGS WILL BE HELD FROM 4 P.M. TO 7 P.M.

YOUR INPUT IS IMPORTANT. WE HOPE YOU WILL ATTEND TO PROVIDE YOUR INPUT ON THE PROPOSED TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT.

####
THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION ARE HOSTING PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS IN YOUR AREA.

TRANSWEST EXPRESS, LLC IS PROPOSING TO CONSTRUCT A 600-KV DC TRANSMISSION LINE FROM SOUTH CENTRAL WYOMING TO SOUTHERN NEVADA SOUTH OF LAS VEGAS. THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION WILL BE PREPARING AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.

YOU ARE INVITED TO ATTEND THE PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS TO LEARN MORE ABOUT THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND TO PROVIDE YOUR COMMENTS.

THE FOLLOWING PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS WILL BE HELD IN YOUR AREA:

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2011
RICHFIELD HIGH SCHOOL
510 WEST 100 SOUTH
RICHFIELD, UTAH

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2011
MILFORD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
450 SOUTH 700 WEST
MILFORD, UTAH

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2011
CEDAR CITY HIGH SCHOOL
703 WEST 600 SOUTH
CEDAR CITY, UTAH

AND

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2011
ST. GEORGE BRANCH
WASHINGTON COUNTY LIBRARY
88 WEST 100 SOUTH
ST. GEORGE, UTAH

ALL MEETINGS WILL BE HELD FROM 4 P.M. TO 7 P.M.

YOUR INPUT IS IMPORTANT. WE HOPE YOU WILL ATTEND TO PROVIDE YOUR INPUT ON THE PROPOSED TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT.

####
THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION ARE HOSTING PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS IN YOUR AREA.

TRANSWEST EXPRESS, LLC IS PROPOSING TO CONSTRUCT A 600-KV DC TRANSMISSION LINE FROM SOUTH CENTRAL WYOMING TO SOUTHERN NEVADA SOUTH OF LAS VEGAS. THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION WILL BE PREPARING AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.

YOU ARE INVITED TO ATTEND THE PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS TO LEARN MORE ABOUT THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND TO PROVIDE YOUR COMMENTS.

THE FOLLOWING PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS WILL BE HELD IN YOUR AREA:

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2011
PINE VALLEY FIRE STATION
860 EAST MAIN
PINE VALLEY, UTAH
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2011

CENTRAL FIRE STATION
155 EAST CENTER STREET
CENTRAL, UTAH

AND

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2011

ENTERPRISE HIGH SCHOOL
565 SOUTH 200 EAST
ENTERPRISE, UTAH

ALL MEETINGS WILL BE HELD FROM 4 P.M. TO 7 P.M.

YOUR INPUT IS IMPORTANT. WE HOPE YOU WILL ATTEND TO PROVIDE YOUR INPUT ON THE PROPOSED TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT.

####

####
THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION ARE HOSTING PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS IN YOUR AREA.

TRANSWEST EXPRESS, LLC IS PROPOSING TO CONSTRUCT A 600-KV DC TRANSMISSION LINE FROM SOUTH CENTRAL WYOMING TO SOUTHERN NEVADA SOUTH OF LAS VEGAS. THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION WILL BE PREPARING AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.

YOU ARE INVITED TO ATTEND THE PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS TO LEARN MORE ABOUT THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND TO PROVIDE YOUR COMMENTS.

THE FOLLOWING PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS WILL BE HELD IN YOUR AREA:

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2011
PINE VALLEY FIRE STATION
860 EAST MAIN
PINE VALLEY, UTAH

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2011
DIXIE DEER SPECIAL SERVICE DISTRICT OFFICE BUILDING
316 NORTH LODGE ROAD
CENTRAL, UTAH

AND

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2011
ENTERPRISE HIGH SCHOOL
565 SOUTH 200 EAST
ENTERPRISE, UTAH

ALL MEETINGS WILL BE HELD FROM 4 P.M. TO 7 P.M.

YOUR INPUT IS IMPORTANT. WE HOPE YOU WILL ATTEND TO PROVIDE YOUR INPUT ON THE PROPOSED TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT.

####
THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION ARE HOSTING PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS IN YOUR AREA.

TRANSWEST EXPRESS, LLC IS PROPOSING TO CONSTRUCT A 600-KV DC TRANSMISSION LINE FROM SOUTH CENTRAL WYOMING TO SOUTHERN NEVADA SOUTH OF LAS VEGAS. THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION WILL BE PREPARING AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.

YOU ARE INVITED TO ATTEND THE PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS TO LEARN MORE ABOUT THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND TO PROVIDE YOUR COMMENTS.

THE FOLLOWING PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS WILL BE HELD IN YOUR AREA:

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2011
CALIENTE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
300 LINCOLN STREET
CALIENTE, NEVADA

TUESDAY, MARCH 1, 2011
CLARK COUNTY COMMUNITY CENTER
320 NORTH MOAPA VALLEY BLVD.
OVERTON, NEVADA (MOAPA VALLEY)

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 2, 2011
HERITAGE PARK SENIOR FACILITY
300 SOUTH RACETRACK ROAD
HENDERSON, NEVADA

AND

THURSDAY, MARCH 3, 2011
DESERT BREEZE COMMUNITY CENTER
8275 SPRING MOUNTAIN
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA

ALL MEETINGS WILL BE HELD FROM 4 P.M. TO 7 P.M.

YOUR INPUT IS IMPORTANT. WE HOPE YOU WILL ATTEND TO PROVIDE YOUR INPUT ON THE PROPOSED TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT.

####
Public Scoping Meetings – As Recorded

THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION ARE HOSTING PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS IN YOUR AREA.

TRANSWEST EXPRESS, LLC IS PROPOSING TO CONSTRUCT A 600-KV DC TRANSMISSION LINE FROM SOUTH CENTRAL WYOMING TO SOUTHERN NEVADA SOUTH OF LAS VEGAS. THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION WILL BE PREPARING AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.

YOU ARE INVITED TO ATTEND THE PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS TO LEARN MORE ABOUT THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND TO PROVIDE YOUR COMMENTS.

THE FOLLOWING PUBLIC SCOPING MEETINGS WILL BE HELD IN YOUR AREA:

TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 2011
JEFFREY CENTER
315 WEST PINE
RAWLINS, WYOMING

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 9, 2011
ROCK SPRINGS HIGH SCHOOL
1375 JAMES DRIVE
ROCK SPRINGS, WYOMING

AND

THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 2011
LSRV HIGHER EDUCATION CENTER
360 WHIPPOORWILL
BAGGS, WYOMING

ALL MEETINGS WILL BE HELD FROM 4 P.M. TO 7 P.M.

YOUR INPUT IS IMPORTANT. WE HOPE YOU WILL ATTEND TO PROVIDE YOUR INPUT ON THE PROPOSED TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT.

####
Appendix C

Libraries with Scoping Materials
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Town(s)</th>
<th>Library/Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Rawlins, Wyoming    | Carbon County Library  
|                     | 215 W. Buffalo Street  
|                     | Rawlins, WY  82301         |
| Rock Springs, Wyoming | Rock Springs Library  
|                     | 400 C Street  
|                     | Rock Springs, WY  82901-6208  |
| Baggs, Wyoming      | Carbon County Libraries Little Snake River Valley  
|                     | 105 2nd Street  
|                     | Baggs, WY  82321           |
| Craig, Colorado     | Moffat County Library  
|                     | 570 Green Street  
|                     | Craig, CO  81625-3028      |
| Rangely, Colorado   | Rangely Regional Library District  
|                     | 109 East Main Street  
|                     | Rangely, CO  81648-2737    |
| Grand Junction, Colorado | Mesa County Library  
|                     | 530 Grand Ave  
|                     | Grand Junction, CO  81501  |
| Moab, Utah          | Grand County Public Library  
|                     | 257 E. Center  
|                     | Moab, UT  84532            |
| Vernal, Utah        | Uintah County Library  
|                     | 155 East Main  
|                     | Vernal, UT  84078          |
| Duchesne, Utah      | Duchesne County Library Duchesne Branch  
|                     | 130 S. Center St., Suite A  
|                     | Duchesne, UT  84021        |
| Castle Dale, Utah   | Emery County Library  
|                     | 145 North 1st East  
|                     | Castle Dale, UT  84513     |
| Nephi, Utah         | Nephi Public Library  
|                     | 21 East 100 North Street  
|                     | Nephi, UT  84648           |
| Delta, Utah         | Delta City Library  
|                     | 76 North 200 West  
|                     | Delta, UT  84624           |
| Richfield, Utah     | Richfield Public Library  
|                     | 83 East Center Street  
|                     | Richfield, UT  84701       |
| Milford, Utah       | Milford Public Library  
|                     | 400 S. 100 West  
<p>|                     | Milford, UT  84751-0009    |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Town(s)</th>
<th>Library/Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cedar City, Utah</td>
<td>Cedar City Public Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>303 N. 100 E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cedar City, UT 84720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise, Central, Pine Valley, Utah</td>
<td>Washington County Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enterprise Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>393 S. 200 East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enterprise, UT 84725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George, Utah</td>
<td>Washington County Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. George Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 S. Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. George, UT 84770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caliente, Nevada</td>
<td>Lincoln County Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caliente Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 Deport Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caliente, NV 89008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moapa, Nevada</td>
<td>Moapa Town Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1340 East Highway 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moapa, NV 89025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson, Nevada</td>
<td>Green Valley Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2797 Green Valley Pkwy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henderson, NV 89014-0244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas, Nevada</td>
<td>Summerlin Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1771 Inner Circle Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Las Vegas, NV 89134-6119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Scoping Materials
TransWest Express
Transmission Project

Environmental Impact Statement

Public Scoping Meeting
Environmental Impact Statement Process
(NEPA Process)

Publish Notice of Intent

90-Day Scoping Period

Prepare Draft EIS
12-24 Months

Publish Draft EIS

90-Day Public Review of Draft EIS

Prepare Final EIS
12-24 Months

Publish Final EIS

30-Day Availability Period

Record of Decision

30-Day Wait Period

Issue ROW Grant

Public Involvement Opportunities
The Project Corridor is the area where the Project transmission line right-of-way could be routed. This area varies in width due to topography and administrative boundaries, but generally is based on a 2-mile width.
The Project Corridor is the area where the Project transmission line right-of-way could be routed. This area varies in width due to topography and administrative boundaries, but generally is based on a 2-mile width.
The Project Corridor is the area where the Project transmission line right-of-way could be routed. This area varies in width due to topography and administrative boundaries, but generally is based on a 2-mile width.
The Project Corridor is the area where the Project transmission line right-of-way could be routed. This area varies in width due to topography and administrative boundaries, but generally is based on a 2-mile width.
The Project Corridor is the area where the Project transmission line right-of-way could be routed. This area varies in width due to topography and administrative boundaries, but generally is based on a 2-mile width.
Joint-Lead Agencies

- Public land management agency under the U.S. Department of the Interior.
- Manages resources on over 245 million surface acres of public lands.
- Manages 700 million acres of subsurface mineral estate.
- BLM public lands are managed for a variety of uses while ensuring protection of the environmental, historic, cultural, and scenic values.

- Federal power marketing administration under the U.S. Department of Energy.
- Markets and transmits Federal power.
- Owns and operates over 17,000 miles of electric transmission across 15 western states.
- Granted authority under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act to construct, finance, facilitate, plan, operate, and/or maintain transmission lines that deliver power from renewable resources.
Property Right Acquisition

- Easements would be needed to construct, operate, and maintain the transmission line.
- Typical transmission line easement – 250 feet wide.
- Typical access road easement – 30 feet wide.
- Every effort would be made to acquire easements through negotiation with landowners. If a negotiated agreement could not be reached, the easements would be acquired through condemnation.

Site Selection

- Access to your property would be requested to conduct surveys and site the transmission line.
- Landowners would be compensated for any damages.

Construction

- Landowners would be notified of the construction schedule.
- Construction crews would be restricted to the area within the acquired easements.
- Construction would occur in phases.
- All work areas and access roads not needed for maintenance would be restored.
- Landowners would be compensated for any crop or property damages.
TransWest Express Project EIS
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We want your comments! If you have any issues, concerns, or questions that you would like addressed in the TransWest Express Transmission Project Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), please complete and submit this comment sheet at the scoping meeting to ensure your input is considered. You can also drop the comment sheet in the mail to the address on the reverse side of this sheet. Fold the comment sheet on the lines with the return address showing, tape it closed, affix a stamp, and mail. You may attach additional pages. Please submit your comments by April 4, 2011. For your comments to be the most effective, the BLM and Western suggest the following guidelines:

- Keep your comments focused on the proposed project;
- Submit your comments on potential impacts and ideas for project alternatives; and
- Submit your comments within the timeframes announced. This helps the agencies include all concerns in the Draft EIS document.

If you have no comments or questions, but would like to be on our mailing list and receive a copy of the Draft EIS, please complete the contact information below.

Please provide your contact information. If you would like to receive copies of the Draft EIS, please fill in the box on the reverse side and submit this form.

Before including your address, phone number, e-mail address or any other personally identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment – including personal identifying information - may be made publicly available at any time. While you may ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Name:___________________________________________________ Title:_____________________

Organization: _______________________________________________________________________

Mailing address:_____________________________________________________________________

City, State, Zipcode:__________________________________________________________________

E-mail:________________________________ Phone:_______________________________________

Thank you for your interest and participation!
TransWest Express Transmission Project
Bureau of Land Management
P.O. Box 20678
Cheyenne, WY 82003

TransWest Express Transmission Project mailing list
To have your name added or removed from our mailing list for this project, please check the appropriate box. Be sure to fill out the contact information on the reverse side. If you do not ask us to remove your name from our mailing list, we will send you future EIS-related announcements.

☐ Yes, add my name to the mailing list to receive future information
☐ No, please remove my name from your mailing list

Sign up to receive the Draft EIS
To receive the Draft EIS check the appropriate box.

☐ Send me the Draft EIS in the following format:
  ☐ CD-rom  ☐ Executive Summary only (about 50 pages)

Printed copies of the Draft EIS (about 500 pages) will be available at your local library or on BLM’s Web site at http://www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/info/NEPA/documents/hdd/transwest.html.
National Environmental Policy Act
Environmental Impact Statement Process

Publish Notice of Intent

90-Day Scoping Period

Prepare Draft EIS
12-24 Months

Publish Draft EIS

90-Day Public Comment Period

Prepare Final EIS
12-24 Months

Publish Final EIS

30-Day Public Availability Period

Respond to Public Comments and Prepare Records of Decision

Issue Records of Decision

Issue ROW Grant

BLM Plan Amendment Process

60-Day Protest Period

Governor’s Consistency Review

Resolve Protest

Adopt Plan Amendment

Public Involvement

Forest Service Plan Amendment Process

Adopt Plan Amendment

105-Day Appeal and Appeal Resolution Period

Issue Special Use Permit
Western Area Power Administration (Western) proposes to acquire most property rights required for the TransWest Express Transmission Project (TWE) under Federal property acquisition guidelines (the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970).

If you own land that would be crossed by the project, a realty agent would contact you to explain the steps involved in site selection, property rights acquisition, and construction.

Site Selection

A realty agent would request permission (for workers or contractors) to enter your property to conduct surveys and studies.

A combination of aerial and land surveys, environmental and engineering field studies, and geologic investigations would be used to select structure sites.

Structures would be located at sites to satisfy design criteria, maintain adequate line-to-ground clearance, and minimize effects to the properties being crossed.

Damage to crops, fences, or other property caused by surveys and studies would be repaired, or landowners would be compensated for damage.

Property Rights Acquisition

Property rights, called easements or rights-of-way, would be needed to construct, operate, and maintain the transmission line. Transmission line easements 250 feet wide are typical for a project of this size.

Access road easements are typically 30 feet wide. Access roads would be narrower than, and would fit within the boundaries of the easement.

Easements would be purchased through negotiations with landowners based on an independent appraisal.

Landowners can be present during the appraisal and identify property features and uses of importance to assist in determining the fair market value of the easement. The landowner would retain title to the land and may continue to use the property in ways that are compatible with the transmission line.

Every effort would be made to acquire easements through negotiations with landowners to obtain an agreement that is fair and reasonable to both parties.

Federal and state laws enable public agencies to acquire property rights for facilities to be built in the public interest.

If a negotiated agreement cannot be reached, easements can be acquired through eminent domain (condemnation) proceedings. Through the eminent domain process, a court determines the compensation to be paid to the property owner.

Construction

A realty agent would advise landowners of the construction schedule. Construction crews would be restricted to the area within the acquired easements.

Preparing the right-of-way for construction may require installing gates and culverts, clearing vegetation, trimming or removing trees, removing structures, and constructing access roads and crane pads.

Construction would occur in several phases as transmission structures are assembled and structures and conductors are installed.

All work areas and access roads not required for maintenance would be restored as nearly as practical to their previous condition. Construction refuse and scrap material would be removed.

Maintenance crews would periodically inspect, repair, and maintain the line. Ground inspections are usually performed one time each year.

Landowners would be compensated for any crop and property damage caused by construction or maintenance of the transmission line.

Living and Working Around Electrical Facilities

Transmission lines are designed and constructed to meet or exceed the requirements of the National Electrical Safety Code. These standards provide for the safety and protection of landowners and their property, the public, and utility employees.

Ranching and farming activities, gardening, recreational activities, and other uses are permitted in the easement as long as care is taken to prevent damage and maintain access to transmission line structures.

No buildings or structures may be erected in the easement because they could impede the safe operation of the line or interfere with maintenance access.

For safety reasons, pumps, wells, swimming pools, and flammables must not be placed in the easement area. Properly grounded and permitted irrigation systems are acceptable.
Introduction

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in Wyoming received an application for right-of-way across federal land from TransWest Express, LLC (the company). The company proposes to construct and operate a 600-kilovolt (kV) direct current transmission line from south-central Wyoming to southern Nevada (the project). The BLM has determined that this is a major federal action that requires an environmental impact statement (EIS) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) and Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR 1500-1508).

The company and Western Area Power Administration (Western) have entered into a non-binding term sheet through which they are evaluating each holding a 50% joint ownership in the project. The company and Western are developing the terms of their joint ownership, such as construction, operation, and maintenance of the project. Under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), Western was granted authority to borrow funds from the U.S. Treasury to (among other things) plan, finance, and construct new or upgraded transmission facilities that deliver renewable energy. Western would use this authority for its participation in the project.

The BLM and Western are serving as joint-lead agencies in preparing the EIS.

Working with other government entities

BLM in Wyoming is designated the lead agency for EIS preparation for the BLM. Fifty federal, state, and county governments were invited to participate as cooperating agencies. To date, 33 agencies have accepted the invitation. BLM and Western also notified 45 tribes and pueblos. A list of cooperating agencies is shown below.

Cooperating Agencies

Federal
- Intermountain Forest Service Region, Ogden, UT
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service representing:
  - Mountain Prairie Region, Lakewood
  - Pacific Southwest Region, Sacramento
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- South Pacific Division
- Northwestern Division
- Navy Region Southwest, San Diego
- Bureau of Reclamation Lower Colorado Region
- U.S. Army Environmental Center, Western Region
- BIA Western Region, Phoenix, representing:
  - Rocky Mountain Region, Billings
  - Southwest Region, Albuquerque

State
- State of Wyoming
- State of Colorado
- State of Utah
- State of Nevada

County
- Carbon County, WY
- Garfield County, CO
- Mesa County, CO
- Moffat County, CO
- Rio Blanco County, CO
- Beaver County, UT
- Duchesne County, UT
- Emery County, UT
- Iron County, UT
- Juab County, UT
- Millard County, UT
- Pite County, UT
- Sevier County, UT
- Uintah County, UT
- Wasatch County, UT
- Clark County, NV
- Lincoln County, NV
- Iron County, UT

Other
- Little Snake River Conservation District
- Medicine Bow Conservation District
- Saratoga-Encampment-Rawlins Conservation District
- Sweetwater County Conservation District

Please join us at any of TransWest Express Scoping Meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 25, 2011</td>
<td>Uintah High School</td>
<td>1606 West 500 North, Vernal, UT</td>
<td>February 17, 2011</td>
<td>St. George Branch</td>
<td>Washington County Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 20, 2011</td>
<td>Moffat County School District Administrative Building</td>
<td>775 Yampa Avenue, Craig, CO</td>
<td>February 22, 2011</td>
<td>Pine Valley Fire Station</td>
<td>850 East Main, Pine Valley, UT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 27, 2011</td>
<td>Northwestern Community College Wees Activity Center</td>
<td>300 Kennedy Drive, Rangeley, CO</td>
<td>February 23, 2011</td>
<td>Central Fire Station</td>
<td>155 East Center Street, Central, UT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1, 2011</td>
<td>Helen M. Knight Elementary</td>
<td>505 N. Mi Vida, Moab, UT</td>
<td>February 28, 2011</td>
<td>Caliente Elementary School</td>
<td>500 Lincoln Street, Caliente, NV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2, 2011</td>
<td>Castle Dale Elementary</td>
<td>195 East 600 North, Castle Dale, UT</td>
<td>March 1, 2011</td>
<td>S. Moapa Valley Blvd, Overton NV (Moapa Valley)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 7, 2011</td>
<td>Duchesne High School</td>
<td>155 West Main Street, Duchesne, UT</td>
<td>March 2, 2011</td>
<td>Heritage Park Senior Facility</td>
<td>300 S. Racetrack Road, Henderson, NV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 8, 2011</td>
<td>Uintah County Courthouse Cultural Hall</td>
<td>160 North Main, Nephi UT</td>
<td>March 3, 2011</td>
<td>Desert Breeze Community Center</td>
<td>8795 Spring Mountain, Las Vegas, NV (Spring Valley)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 14, 2011</td>
<td>Richfield High School</td>
<td>500 West 100 South, Richfield, UT</td>
<td>March 9, 2011</td>
<td>Rock Springs High School</td>
<td>1725 James Drive, Rock Springs, WY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 15, 2011</td>
<td>Milford Elementary School</td>
<td>450 South 700 West, Milford, UT</td>
<td>March 10, 2011</td>
<td>LVUV Higher Education Center</td>
<td>360 Whipplepowl, Baggs, WY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 16, 2011</td>
<td>Cedar City High School</td>
<td>703 West 600 South, Cedar City, UT</td>
<td></td>
<td>All Scoping meetings will be held from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The joint-lead agencies also will lead consultations with:

- American Indian tribes (Government-to-Government)
- State Historic Preservation Officers in Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and Nevada in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966; and

AECOM is the third-party environmental consultant helping the BLM and Western with their responsibilities.

Where would the project be located?
The transmission line would be approximately 725 miles long and may cross 4 states and 24 counties, depending on the alternative route selected (see map, page 3). The line would originate in south-central Wyoming, cross northwestern Colorado, traverse Utah with the potential to connect to the Intermountain Power Plant near Delta, Utah, and terminate in southern Nevada near the existing Marketplace substation. As part of the project, substation/converter stations, a fiber optic network communications system, two ground electrode facilities, and access roads would be constructed. When complete, the project would provide capacity of up to 3,000 megawatts of electricity.

What is the purpose for preparing an EIS?
An EIS is prepared for major federal actions that may have a significant effect on the environment. The effects of a proposed project are analyzed in an EIS to determine potential environmental impacts and methods needed for mitigation. Along with the EIS, existing agency land use plans may need to be amended. Plan amendments will be completed in compliance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 and regulations, policies, and guidelines of the land management agencies requiring the plan amendments.

What is the process for preparing an EIS and plan amendments?
Preparing an EIS has a number of steps, as shown in the diagram to the right. The EIS begins with publishing a Federal Register Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS, which commences a 90-day public scoping period. BLM and Western will complete data collection for each of the resources and their uses potentially affected in the project area. In coordination with the cooperating agencies, BLM and Western will assess the impacts that the project may have on each of the resources and their uses and apply measures to mitigate the impacts. Alternatives will be compared and a preferred alternative(s) will be selected. The process will be documented and the impacts disclosed in the Draft EIS and plan amendments when a 90-day public review and comment period will be held. Comments will be analyzed and responses to the comments will be included in a Final EIS and proposed plan amendments.

How can you participate in the EIS process?
BLM and Western encourage you to attend a scoping meeting to learn about the project and submit your comments, questions, and concerns. In addition to scoping, you are encouraged to stay informed by using the following information tools:

- BLM’s project website (http://www.blm.gov/wylist/en/info/NEPA/documents/Issue/TransWest.html); and Western’s project website (www.wapa.gov/transmission/TransWestExpress.htm).
- An extensive mailing list to send newsletters and updated information.

Environmental Impact Statement Process (NEPA Process)
- Publish Notice of Intent
- Prepare Draft EIS 12-24 Months
- Publish Draft EIS
- 90-Day Public Review of Draft EIS
- Prepare Final EIS 12-24 Months
- Publish Final EIS
- 30-Day Availability Period
- Record of Decision
- 30-Day Wait Period
- Issue ROW Grant

Tips for Providing Effective Comments
Your participation is an important part of the decision-making process.
- Submit your comments on potential impacts and ideas for project alternatives.
- Review the BLM and Western websites, monitor local newspapers, attend public meetings, and become familiar with the proposed project development.
- Provide substantive and concise written comments.
- Learn about the NEPA process and when in the process agencies will receive comments.
- Keep your comments focused on the proposed project being analyzed.
- Submit your comments within the timeframes announced. This helps the agencies include all concerns in the NEPA document.
- Make sure that you are on the EIS mailing list to receive notification of public meetings or project information, or both.

How to Submit Comments
- Written comments may be submitted at the public scoping meetings, or
- You may mail your comments to: Bureau of Land Management TransWest Express Project P.O. Box 20678 Cheyenne, WY 82003, or
- You may email your comments to: TransWest_WYMail@blm.gov
Proposed Intermountain Transmission Projects

**TransWest Express Transmission Project**
- 600-kV Direct Current (DC) Transmission Line.
- Approximately 725 miles long, originating in Rawlins, Wyoming and terminating south of Las Vegas, Nevada.
- Traversing four states – Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and Nevada.
- BLM is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement.
- Public scoping begins Winter 2011.

**Energy Gateway West Transmission Project**

**Energy Gateway South Transmission Project**

**Mona to Oquirrh Transmission Project**

**Sigurd to Red Butte Transmission Project**

**ON TRANSMISSION Project /SWIP**

**Southern Nevada Intertie Project (SNIP)**
The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is responding to a request from TransWest Express, LLC, to obtain a right-of-way for the use of public lands to construct and operate an extra-high voltage transmission line. The BLM will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in conformance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The purpose of the EIS is for the BLM to evaluate and disclose potential impacts of the proposed project and alternatives; to determine whether to issue a right of way (ROW) grant; and to amend BLM Resource Management Plans (RMPs) as needed.

The BLM is required to evaluate and make decisions regarding the granting of rights-of-way in response to proponent applications. Under Section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended (30 U.S.C. 185), the BLM is authorized to issue ROW grants. It is the policy of the BLM to authorize all ROW applications that are in conformance with approved land use plans at the discretion of the authorized officer.

Under Section 402 of the Recovery Act, Western may borrow funds from the United States Treasury to construct, finance, facilitate, plan, operate, maintain, and/or study construction of new or upgraded electric power transmission lines and related facilities. Prior to committing funds, Western must certify that the project is in the public interest; will not adversely impact system reliability or operations, or other statutory obligations; and it is reasonable to expect that the proceeds from the project shall be adequate to make repayment of the loan.

On March 4, 2009 Western solicited interest in proposed transmission projects that resulted in the submission of Statements of Interest including one for the TWE Project. Western needs to decide whether to participate in the TWE Project as a joint owner with TransWest Express, LLC as part of Western’s Transmission Infrastructure Program (TIP) and consistent with its Recovery Act authority. For Western to participate, Western needs the TWE Project to satisfy the requirements of Western’s TIP and its Recovery Act authority.