

Eastern Plains Transmission Project, Colorado and Kansas

Environmental Impact Statement Scoping Summary Report Addendum (DOE/EIS-0390)

June 2007



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	1-1
1.1	Description of the Proposed Project.....	1-1
1.2	Purpose of This Report	1-2
1.3	Information Considered for This Report.....	1-5
2.0	EXTENDED COMMENT PERIOD.....	2-1
2.1	Identification of Stakeholders	2-1
2.2	Notification of Stakeholders	2-2
2.3	Agency and Government Communications	2-5
2.4	Public Meetings.....	2-7
2.5	Public Meeting Attendance Summary.....	2-8
3.0	SCOPING COMMENTS SUMMARY	3-1
3.1	Comments Received.....	3-3
3.2	Comment Categories	3-5
3.3	Comments on Topics to be Considered in the EIS	3-5
3.3.1	Access and Transportation.....	3-5
3.3.2	Agriculture	3-6
3.3.3	Air Quality	3-7
3.3.4	Aquatic Species and Habitats	3-8
3.3.5	Cultural and Historic Resources.....	3-8
3.3.6	Electrical Characteristics and Radio and Television Interference.....	3-8
3.3.7	Environmental Justice	3-9
3.3.8	Floodplains and Wetlands	3-9
3.3.9	Geology	3-10
3.3.10	Hazardous Materials and Solid Waste	3-10
3.3.11	Health and Safety	3-11
3.3.12	Land Use	3-11
3.3.13	Noise	3-12
3.3.14	Paleontology.....	3-13
3.3.15	Recreation	3-13
3.3.16	Social and Economic Values.....	3-13
3.3.17	Soils.....	3-14
3.3.18	Special Status Species.....	3-14
3.3.19	Vegetation	3-15
3.3.20	Visual Resources.....	3-16
3.3.21	Water	3-17
3.3.22	Wildlife	3-17
3.4	Topics to be Considered as Cumulative Effects	3-18
3.4.1	Conflicts with Existing Utilities and Transmission Lines.....	3-19
3.4.2	Conflicts with Reasonably Foreseeable and Other Future Projects ...	3-19
3.5	Comments on Tri-State's Generation	3-19
3.5.1	Access and Transportation.....	3-19
3.5.2	Agriculture	3-20
3.5.3	Air Quality	3-20
3.5.4	Alternatives to Supercritical Pulverized Coal-Fired Generation	3-21
3.5.5	Climate	3-22

3.5.6	Cultural and Historic Resources	3-22
3.5.7	Cumulative Effects	3-22
3.5.8	Environmental Justice	3-22
3.5.9	Construction and Operation of Facilities	3-22
3.5.10	Hazardous Materials and Solid Waste	3-23
3.5.11	Health and Safety	3-23
3.5.12	Land Use	3-23
3.5.13	Mitigation	3-24
3.5.14	Noise	3-24
3.5.15	Process and Public Involvement	3-24
3.5.16	Social and Economic Values	3-24
3.5.17	Special Status Species	3-24
3.5.18	Vegetation	3-25
3.5.19	Visual Resources	3-25
3.5.20	Water	3-25
3.5.21	Wildlife	3-25
3.6	Comments on Interconnection of Renewable Energy Sources	3-26
3.7	Comments on Process and Public Involvement	3-26
3.8	Comments on Proposed and Alternative Corridors	3-27
3.8.1	General Comments	3-28
3.8.2	Route-Specific Comments	3-29

TABLES

Table 1.1-1	EPTP Transmission Line Segments	1-1
Table 2.2-1	Radio Stations	2-2
Table 2.2-2	Newspaper Publications	2-3
Table 2.3-1	County Meetings	2-5
Table 2.3-2	Agencies Contacted	2-6
Table 2.4-1	Public Meetings	2-7
Table 3.1-1	Substantive Comments	3-4

FIGURES

Figure 1.1-1	Proposed and Alternative Routes	1-3
--------------	---------------------------------------	-----

APPENDICES

Appendix A	Pre-scoping and Scoping Materials
Appendix B	Stakeholder List
Appendix C	Consolidated Scoping Comments

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AQRV	air quality-related values
ARM	Adaptive Resource Management
BACT	Best Available Control Technology
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
CCS	carbon dioxide capture and storage
DEIS	Draft Environmental Impact Statement
DOE	Department of Energy
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EMF	Electric and magnetic fields
EPTP	Eastern Plains Transmission Project
ESA	Endangered Species Act
GPS	global positioning system
HAPs	hazardous air pollutant
IGCC	integrated gasification combined cycle
IREA	Intermountain Rural Electric Association
KDWP	Kansas Department of Wildlife and Parks
kV	kilovolt
MACT	Maximum Available Control Technology
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NOI	Notice of Intent
NPS	National Parks Service
PA	Programmatic Agreement
POD	point of delivery
PSAs	public service announcements
PSD	Prevention of Significant Deterioration
PV	photovoltaic
ROWs	Rights-of-way
RDP	Resource Development Plan
THPO	Tribal Historic Preservation Office
Tri-State	Tri-State Generation and Transmission Association, Inc.
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
Western	Western Area Power Administration

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

1.0 Introduction

This report is an addendum to the Scoping Summary Report for the Eastern Plains Transmission Project (EPTP) issued in January 2007. This addendum describes the public involvement activities conducted since January 2007 as part of the NEPA process and EIS preparation for the EPTP. The primary focus of these activities was a series of public meetings in February 2007, as well as an extended scoping period that ended on March 9, 2007. Western extended the scoping period to provide the public and stakeholders a second opportunity to comment on issues and concerns, and to review the revised proposed and alternative transmission line routes. This addendum reports and categorizes all comments received on the project from public scoping, August 2006 to December 31, 2006, and an additional comment period, January 1, 2007, through March 16, 2007.

1.1 Description of the Proposed Project

The EPTP would consist of approximately 1,000 miles of new transmission lines, new or expanded substation facilities, and associated communication facilities in eastern Colorado and western Kansas. The EPTP analysis area covers part or all of 16 counties in eastern Colorado and 8 counties in western Kansas: Adams, Arapahoe, Bent, Cheyenne, Crowley, Elbert, El Paso, Kiowa, Kit Carson, Lincoln, Morgan, Pueblo, Prowers, Washington, Weld, and Yuma counties in Colorado, and Finney, Greeley, Hamilton, Kearny, Logan, Sherman, Wallace, and Wichita counties in Kansas.

The EPTP would consist of 15 new high-voltage transmission lines connecting to eight expanded and four new substations in eastern Colorado and western Kansas. Table 1.1-1 lists the individual project segments and their lengths. Figure 1.1-1 shows the extent of the EPTP as it was shown to stakeholders at the public meetings. Eight of the transmission lines (771 miles) would be 500-kilovolt (kV) lines. The 500-kV structures would be latticed steel. Two of the transmission lines (155 miles) would be 345-kV. The 345-kV structures would be latticed steel. Five of the transmission lines (133 miles) would be 230-kV. The 230-kV structures would be wood or steel H-frames. Western may consider steel single-pole construction in congested areas for any of the transmission lines.

Table 1.1-1 EPTP Transmission Line Segments

Transmission Line Segment	Approximate Length (miles)
500-kV Rolling Hills Substation ¹ to Energy Center Substation ¹	87
500-kV Rolling Hills Substation ¹ to Burlington Substation ²	163
500-kV Energy Center Substation ¹ to Burlington Substation ²	85
230-kV Energy Center Substation ¹ to Lamar Substation ² (two single-circuit lines in separate right-of-ways, with a 3-mile separation goal)	37
500-kV Energy Center Substation ¹ to Boone Substation ²	115
500-kV Energy Center Substation ¹ to Big Sandy Substation ²	116

Transmission Line Segment	Approximate Length (miles)
500-kV Burlington Substation ² to Big Sandy Substation ²	79
230-kV Burlington Substation ² to Wray Substation ²	60
500-kV Boone Substation ² to Midway Substation ²	38
500-kV Midway Substation ² to Big Sandy Substation ²	88
345-kV Big Sandy Substation ² to Beaver Creek Substation ²	72
345-kV Big Sandy Substation ² to Green Valley Substation ²	83
230-kV Green Valley Substation ² to Beaver Creek-Erie Tap ¹	10
230-kV Big Sandy Substation ² to 125-mile Substation ¹	26
Approximate Total Miles	1,059

¹ New substation, ² Existing substation

New substations would be constructed at Rolling Hills (near Holcomb, Kansas), Energy Center (east of Lamar, Colorado), 125-mile (north of Simla, Colorado), and north of the existing Green Valley Substation along the existing Beaver Creek-Erie transmission line. Existing substations that would be expanded include Burlington (near Burlington, Colorado), Lamar (near Lamar, Colorado), Boone (near Boone, Colorado), Big Sandy (near Limon, Colorado), Wray (near Wray, Colorado), Midway (near Fountain, Colorado), Beaver Creek (near Brush, Colorado), and Green Valley (northeast of Denver, Colorado). The communication system for each of the transmission line segments would consist of a fiber optic cable integrated with one of the two static ground wires placed at the top of the structures. Regeneration sites are typically located every 50 miles along fiber optic lines to refresh degraded signals. Regeneration sites would be located where electrical power from a distribution system and existing access are available.

1.2 Purpose of This Report

This addendum to the scoping summary report does the following:

- Describes coordination with Federal, state, and local agencies; Native American tribes; other interested parties; and the public on the scope of actions, alternatives, and effects that will be studied in the EIS.
- Provides information about the public meetings, including preparation activities and participation statistics.
- Lists all comments provided by commenters between January 1, 2007 and March 16, 2007, including those associated with the February public meetings consolidated by topic into groups of comments (Appendix C).
- Consolidates and summarizes the comments received during both comment periods to help define the scope of the EIS.

Figure 1.1-1 Proposed and Alternative Routes

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

1.3 Information Considered for This Report

Information considered for this report was collected in the following ways:

- Comments submitted orally, in writing, or on route maps at public open houses held at 10 locations in eastern Colorado and western Kansas during February 2007.
- Meetings or correspondence with Federal, state, and local agencies; Native American tribes; landowners; and other stakeholders.
- Comments mailed to Western, left on the EPTP hotline, or submitted electronically by fax, email, or on the project website during the comment period that ended on March 9, 2007.
- Comments postmarked after December 31, 2006, but no later than March 9, 2007, and received no later than March 16, 2007.

Subsequent sections of this report provide additional detail on the types of input received from participants.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

2.0 Extended Comment Period

Western extended the public comment period for the EPTP that began with a series of public meetings in August 2006 with a second series of public meetings in February 2007. This section describes the comment period process associated with the February 2007 public meetings. This report considers those comments received after December 31, 2006, and no later than March 16, 2007.

The Notice to hold public meetings in February 2007 was published in the *Federal Register* on January 19, 2007. Western held the public meetings to provide an opportunity for stakeholders to comment on proposed and alternative transmission line routes; additional, revised, or new transmission line routes; the scope of the EIS; and comments previously received during scoping in August and September 2006. Western will use the information received to help identify potential environmental issues, action alternatives, and mitigation measures associated with the project. Western will also use the results of the scoping comment period and the extended comment period to focus and clarify the issues to be addressed in the EIS.

Public involvement activities included publication of the notice to hold public meetings; identification and notification of new and existing landowners and stakeholders; press releases and meeting announcements in newspapers, on the radio, and by flyer distribution; correspondence with potentially affected Federal, state, and local agencies and tribes; individual meetings with county representatives in the analysis area; and the public meetings, themselves. Each of these activities is described in more detail below.

2.1 Identification of Stakeholders

The stakeholder list identifies interested individuals, non-government organizations, interest groups, and agencies that were notified of scoping. Western compiled the list of stakeholders from mailing lists generated during pre-scoping public involvement efforts by Western and Tri-State, and contacts with agencies and Tribes. This list facilitated information sharing, public education, and identification of key milestones for announcements, such as public meetings and comment or review deadlines. Stakeholders include:

- Interested individuals and businesses
- Potentially affected landowners
- Congressional representatives
- Native American tribal governments
- Federal, state, county, and local agencies and elected and appointed representatives
- Cooperating agencies to the EIS
- Special interest groups
- News media

Appendix B contains the list of stakeholders notified of the February 2007 public meetings. It does not include potentially affected landowners who had not commented or signed in at a scoping meeting before the February 2007 public meetings. As new stakeholders are identified throughout the project, the list will continue to be revised.

2.2 Notification of Stakeholders

In preparation for presenting the updated route adjustments and receiving input, Western sent postcards to its original mailing list on November 21, 2006. The postcards explained that a second round of public meetings would be scheduled in February 2007. A copy of the postcard is included in Appendix A.

On January 19, 2007, Western published a notice in the *Federal Register* announcing the 10 public meetings held between February 12, 2007 and February 23, 2007 in the following locations: Avondale, Colorado Springs, Brush, Burlington, Byers, Lamar, Limon, and Wray, Colorado and Lakin and Sharon Springs, Kansas. The notice invited public participation in the EIS scoping process. This included soliciting public comments on the scope and content of the EIS and on proposed and alternative transmission line routes. A copy of the notice is included in Appendix A.

The meeting announcement also circulated through media outlets serving the affected communities on January 30, 2007. A press release was distributed to local TV, radio, and newspapers on January 30, 2007. The press release provided general notice and a description of the project as well as requests for public comment. This press release listed the times, dates, and locations of the public meetings. A copy of the press release is included in Appendix A.

Public service announcements were distributed to local radio stations and aired starting February 5, 2007. These radio stations are listed in Table 2.2-1. Copies of the text for each community are included in Appendix A.

Table 2.2-1 Radio Stations

Radio Station	Format	Audience Served
KCFR	National Public Radio	Byers, Colorado
K214CO (KANZ)	National Public Radio	Lamar, Colorado
K210CC (KRCC)	National Public Radio	Limon, Colorado
KSY Y	Spanish	Limon/Fort Morgan/Wray, Colorado
KRCC	National Public Radio	Hanover, Colorado
KGDQ	Spanish	Hanover, Colorado
KSIR	Farm	Fort Morgan/Brush, Colorado

Radio Station	Format	Audience Served
K228 DL (KUNC)	National Public Radio	Wray, Colorado
KLOE	News/Talk	Burlington, Colorado and Sharon Springs, Kansas
KANZ	National Public Radio	Holcomb, Kansas
KSSA	Spanish	Holcomb, Kansas

Western published advertisements in 13 local newspapers in the weeks before the public meetings. Advertisements were distributed to local newspapers and ran approximately two weeks before the corresponding meeting in the community the newspaper serves. The advertisements included meeting times, dates, and locations, as well as an open invitation to attend public meetings. A list of the specific dates and newspapers that published the advertisements are listed in Table 2.2-2. A copy of the standard newspaper advertisement is included in Appendix A.

Table 2.2-2 Newspaper Publications

Newspaper	Publication Frequency	Publication Date
Lamar Daily News	Daily	February 7, 10, 11, 14, 17, and 18, 2007
Limon Leader	Weekly (Wednesday)	January 31, 2007 and February 7, 2007
Fountain Valley News	Weekly (Wednesday)	February 14 and 21, 2007
Fort Morgan Times	Daily	January 31, 2007 and February 3, 4, 7, 10, and 11, 2007
Wray Gazette	Weekly	February 7 and 14, 2007
Burlington Record	Weekly	February 1 and 8, 2007
Garden City Telegram	Daily	February 7, 10, 11, 14, and 18, 2007
Brush News Tribune	Weekly (Wednesday)	January 31, 2007 and February 7, 2007
Pueblo Chieftain	Daily	February 10, 11, 14, 17, 18, and 21, 2007
Goodland Star News	Twice weekly (Tuesday and Friday)	February 6, 8, 13, and 15, 2007
Sharon Springs Western Times	Weekly (Wednesdays in town, and Thursdays to residents)	February 7 and 14, 2007
Lakin Independent	Weekly (Thursday)	February 8 and 15, 2007
I-70 Scout- Strasburg	Weekly- Tuesday	February 6 and 13, 2007

Western also provided an announcement that was published in the January 2007 edition of the *Colorado Country Life* magazine. The advertisements contained the times, dates, and locations of the public meetings, along with project details and contact information. *Colorado Country Life* has a distribution of approximately 175,000 that includes all members of electric cooperatives in Colorado. A copy of the advertisement is included in Appendix A.

Western prepared a flyer for distribution to Tri-State's member cooperatives in the analysis area. The member cooperatives posted the flyer in locations where the public would be likely to see them, such as the cooperative offices, U.S. Post Offices, and other prominent locations. A copy of the flyer is included in Appendix A.

During the month of January, individual mailings were sent to approximately 6,700 stakeholders, including approximately 1,700 new landowners potentially affected by route adjustments since August and September 2006. Newly affected landowners received a comprehensive package with a letter, a project brochure, a comment form, an EPTP route map, and one or more parcel maps corresponding to the landowner's property. The original 5,000 stakeholders received a newsletter of EPTP updates and a revised route map. Copies of all documents included in the new landowner mailing and existing stakeholder mailing are included in Appendix A.

Notices that included the times, dates, and locations of the public meetings and contact information were included in the January utility bills of electrical cooperatives in the EPTP analysis area. Tri-State sent approximately 80,000 notices to members of YW Electric, KC Electric, Morgan County Electric, Southeast Colorado Power Association, Mountain View Electric, Pioneer Electric, and Wheatland Electric. A copy of the notice is included in Appendix A.

The Winter 2007 edition of *Powering the West* newsletter, which is distributed to all of Tri-State's cooperative members and about 300 other stakeholders, featured an article on the EPTP, including the times, dates, and locations of the public meetings and contact information. A copy of the Winter 2007 *Powering the West* newsletter is included in Appendix A.

Western maintains a web site for the EPTP (<http://www.wapa.gov/transmission/eptp.htm>), which provides notice of the public meetings; background documentation on the project such as the NOI and notice for public meetings, project description, and maps; and an online comment form. Tri-State also maintains a web site for the project (<http://www.tristategt.org/rp/transmission.cfm>), which provides information on the project, including announcements of public meetings. The website addresses were provided to the public through materials provided in mailings, advertisements, and public meetings.

2.3 Agency and Government Communications

Native American Tribal contacts and Federal, state, and local agencies received the same mailing as other stakeholders in January 2007, which consisted of a newsletter of EPTP updates and a revised route map.

Western and Tri-State held informational meetings with county governments and planning administrators. Table 2.3-1 provides the date, time, and location of each county meeting. Representatives from Tri-State and Western provided county officials with copies of the same information and materials provided at the public meetings. They received copies of display boards and fact sheets; mailings, including a landowner brochure, the new landowner notification letter, and the EPTP newsletter; comment forms; and copies of the Federal Register notice of the public meetings. In addition, the county officials received a map specific to their county that illustrated the corresponding proposed and alternative transmission lines.

Table 2.3-1 County Meetings

County	Date and Time	Location
Washington County	Monday, February 12 11:00 a.m.	County building, 150 Ash St. Akron, Colorado
Morgan County	Monday, February 12 10:30 a.m.	County building, 231 Ensign St. Fort Morgan, Colo.
Lincoln County	Tuesday, February 13 10:00 a.m.	County building, 103 3rd Ave. Hugo, Colorado
Cheyenne County	Wednesday, February 14 10:30 a.m.	County building, 51 S. 1st St. Cheyenne Wells, Colorado
Yuma County	Thursday, February 15 10:30 a.m.	Wray Town Hall, 245 W. 4th St. Wray, Colorado
Kit Carson County	Thursday, February 15 10:00 a.m.	County health office, 252 S. 14th St. Burlington, Colorado
Kearny County	Tuesday, February 20 9:00 a.m.	County building, 102 E. Prairie Ave. Lakin, Kansas
Sherman County	Tuesday, February 20 9:00 a.m.	County building, 813 Broadway Goodland, Kansas
Kiowa County	Wednesday, February 21 10:00 a.m.	County building, 1305 Goff Eads, Colorado
Prowers County	Wednesday, February 21 10:30 a.m.	County building, 301 S. Main St. Lamar, Colorado
Pueblo County	Thursday, February 22 10:00 a.m.	County building, 229 W. 12th St. Pueblo, Colorado
Crowley County	Friday, February 23 10:30 a.m.	County building, 603 Main St. Ordway, Colorado
Greeley County	Tuesday, March 14 8:00 a.m.	Greeley County building Tribune, Kansas

County	Date and Time	Location
Wallace County	Tuesday, March 14 1:30 p.m.	Wallace County courthouse, 313 Main St. Sharon Springs, Kansas
Finney County	Thursday, March 15 2:00 p.m.	Finney County building Garden City, Kansas
Adams County	Tuesday, March 20 2:15 p.m.	12200 N. Pecos Westminster, Colorado
Arapahoe County	Thursday, March 29 10:00 a.m.	10730 E. Briarwood Ave., Ste. 100 Centennial, Colorado
Elbert County	Thursday, April 19 1:00 p.m.	Elbert County Courthouse Kiowa, Colorado
Hamilton County	Tuesday, May 8 8:00 a.m.	N. Main Street Syracuse, Kansas
El Paso County	Wednesday, May 23 1:00 p.m.	27 E. Vermijo Ave Colorado Springs, Colorado

The meeting with Hamilton County, Kansas, officials was scheduled in February but was cancelled because of an unexpected conflict. Representatives from Western and Tri-State left the meeting materials and their contact information for rescheduling. Tri-State representatives met with Hamilton County in May.

Tribal contacts who requested to remain on the mailing list are included in the stakeholder list in Appendix B. Agencies contacted are listed in Table 2.3-2.

Table 2.3-2 Agencies Contacted

Agency Name	Agency Name
• City and town officials in the analysis area	• Colorado Dept. of Transportation
• Colorado Division of Wildlife	• Colorado Historical Society
• Colorado Natural Heritage Program	• Colorado Public Utilities Commission
• Colorado State Land Board	• Colorado State Parks
• Colorado State Board of Land Commissioners	• Governors of Colorado and Kansas
• County Commissioners, planning departments, and other county agencies	• Kansas Dept. of Health and Environment
• Kansas Corporation Commission	• Kansas Dept. of Wildlife and Parks
• Kansas Dept. of Transportation	• Kansas State Historical Society
• Kansas Natural Heritage Inventory	• U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
• Kansas Biological Survey	• U.S. Bureau of Land Management
• U.S. Army Installation Management Agency	• U.S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development
• U.S. Bureau of Reclamation	• U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
• U.S. Dept. of Veteran's Affairs	• U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency

Agency Name	Agency Name
• U.S. Federal Highway Administration	• U.S. National Park Service
• U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	• U.S.D.A Forest Service
• U.S.D.A Farm Service Agency	• U.S.D.A Rural Utilities Service
• U.S.D.A Natural Resources Conservation Service	• U.S. Department of the Interior
• U.S. Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	• National Park Service
• U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Railroad Administration	• U.S. Department of Army, Pueblo Chemical Depot

2.4 Public Meetings

Western conducted 10 public meetings in February 2007. Table 2.4-1 lists the dates and locations for these meetings. Not all meetings were held at the same locations as the August and September 2006 public scoping meetings. In several cases, meeting locations were moved to be closer to potentially affected landowners and other stakeholders.

Table 2.4-1 Public Meetings

Date of Meeting	Facility	Location
February 12, 2007	The Carroll Building	Brush, Colorado
February 13, 2007	Limon Community Building	Limon, Colorado
February 14, 2007	Burlington Education and Community Center	Burlington, Colorado
February 15, 2007	The Community Room at City Hall	Wray, Colorado
February 16, 2007	Byers High School	Byers, Colorado
February 19, 2007	Veteran's Memorial Building	Lakin, Kansas
February 20, 2007	Wallace County School	Sharon Springs, Kansas
February 21, 2007	Lamar Community Building	Lamar, Colorado
February 22, 2007	Hanover Jr/Sr High School	Colorado Springs, CO
February 23, 2007	McHarg Park Community Center	Avondale, CO

The public meetings ran from 3:00 pm to 7:00 pm to allow the public flexibility to attend at their convenience. An exception to this schedule was the Hanover, Colorado, meeting, which ran from 4:00 pm to 8:00 pm because of a scheduling conflict with school activities.

Western selected an open house format for the meetings. Large-format informational displays and take-home fact sheets provided information about the project. Large, laminated sheet maps based on aerial photography and parcel boundaries illustrated the reference centerlines and corridors for proposed and alternative routes. The sheet maps facilitated work with landowners and interested individuals to identify properties, issues, and concerns within specific alternative corridors. Commenters were able to note route-specific suggestions directly on the sheet maps. Sign-in sheets provided additional stakeholder contact information that was added to the mailing list.

Western staffed the public meetings with agency representatives who could respond to public comments and questions, including the project manager, the EIS manager, two realty specialists, an electrical engineer, and a public information specialist. EDAW, the firm contracted by Western to assist with the EIS, staffed the meetings with their project manager, assistant project manager, electrical characteristics expert, and a project assistant to aid with meeting logistics and recording of public comments. Tri-State staffed the meetings with their transmission project manager, public relations manager, and project environmental manager to answer technical questions about the project.

2.5 Public Meeting Attendance Summary

Six hundred and sixty seven individuals signed in at the public meetings held in February 2007. Landowners with agricultural or residential land were the primary attendees. Additional attendees included representatives from Colorado Department of Wildlife, the Kansas Department of Wildlife and Parks (KDWP), The Colorado State Land Board, Kansas Department of Transportation, local government officials, local electrical utility representatives, the media, environmental groups, local financial institutions, local school district representatives, local business owners, wind energy advocates, and other interested parties.

3.0 Scoping Comments Summary

Western initially identified potential issues to be considered in the EIS through internal and interagency discussions during proposal development. The following list of potential environmental issues was identified in the NOI to hold public scoping meetings published on August 2, 2006. This list was designed to help the public frame its comments on the scope of the EIS:

- Effects on protected, threatened, endangered, or sensitive species of animals or plants or their critical habitats
- Effects on other biological resources
- Effects on land use, recreation, and transportation
- Effects on floodplains and wetlands
- Effects on cultural or historic resources and Tribal values
- Effects on human health and safety (including military, civilian, and agricultural aviation safety)
- Effects on air, soil, and water resources
- Effects on agricultural operations
- Effects on visual resources
- Effects on socioeconomic resources and disproportionately high and adverse impacts on minority and low-income groups

Based on the comments received during the initial scoping period of August to December 2006, new issues were identified and the existing issues were refined. No formal list was issued with the Notice to hold public meetings released in January 2007. The following list is a summary of environmental topics requested for consideration in the comments received during the initial public scoping period starting August 2, 2006, and ending December 31, 2006.

- Effects on access and transportation including ground and air traffic, infrastructure, overland access during construction and operation, and safety
- Effects on agricultural operations, farmland and rangeland, livestock, and land value
- Effects on air quality from construction and operation
- Effects on animals including domestic livestock, wildlife, special status species, aquatic and avian species, and their habitats
- Effect on cultural, historic, and tribal resources
- Effects on other electrical systems in close proximity to high voltage power lines

- Effects of high voltage power lines including radio and television interference, noise, and EMF
- Effects on the health and safety of humans, livestock, wildlife, and vegetation in close proximity to high voltage power lines
- Effects on rural, low income, and/or low population communities
- Effects on floodplains, wetlands, surface water, springs, seeps, and aquifers
- Effects on area geology including topography and soil stability and erosion
- Effects of hazardous materials and solid waste
- Effects on the use of federal, state, public, and private land including traditional, historic, current, and future land use
- Effects on recreation activities and areas
- Effects on social and economic resources including property and land values, communities, and economies
- Effects on vegetation including habitats, grassland, native prairie, wetland and riparian vegetation
- Effects on visual resources including scenic viewsheds
- Effects on water resources including quality, quantity, and sources

In addition to the list above, several unique comments were received that did not fit into a defined resource topic.

- Cumulative effects of the project on resources including agriculture, wildlife, economies, land use, existing utilities, and future projects
- Effects and cumulative effects of Tri-State's proposed generation facilities on access and transportation, agriculture, air quality, climate, cultural and historic resources, environmental justice, hazardous materials and solid waste, health and safety, land use, noise, social and economic values, special status species, vegetation, visual resources, water, and wildlife
- Consideration of alternatives to Tri-State's coal fired generation
- Consideration of alternative energy sources
- Process and public involvement, including the NEPA and public involvement processes and activities
- Assessment of proposed and alternative corridors

Western invited interested parties to suggest specific topics within these general categories or other topics not included above for consideration in the EIS. This list was not intended to be all inclusive or to imply predetermination of effects.

Individuals, organizations, and agencies provided comments during the additional comment period that will be used to further identify and refine the issues. The substantive comments received during the public scoping process, which includes both comment periods, are the basis of the issues described in the following sections of this report. Not all comments relate to the scope of the EIS. For example, comments expressing general support for, or opposition to, the proposed project or requests to remain informed of project progress are not included. Comments are provided in Appendix C.

3.1 Comments Received

Western received comments by many different methods during both comment periods. Commenters provided comments in forms, letters, email, fax, phone correspondence, on the project web site, and the online comment form. Western received comments at the public meetings orally, on comment forms, and as written suggestions on sheet maps. The written comments on the sheet maps were primarily site-specific information or concerns regarding particular proposed and alternative corridors. The map comments received during the public meetings in February 2007 were also recorded in the comment database. Representatives from Western and Tri-State engaged many stakeholders at the public meetings and recorded oral comments on comment sheets with the approval or on request from commenters. After the meetings, representatives responded to information requests that could not be answered at the meetings.

Western examined the comments received during the scoping period and entered all comments into a database. In the database, each comment is associated with the commenter's name and contact information as well as a topic (for example, alternatives, water resources, or generation). Appendix C contains a listing of the substantive comments, organized by topic. Appendix C does not contain the name and contact information of each commenter. All of the comments were considered in development of the issues summary section of this scoping report.

Table 3.1-1 displays the number of specific comments received for each topic. The comments include comments received in all formats from agencies, individuals, and organizations during the comment period. The order of topics in Table 3.1-1 and Appendix C does not imply importance or level of interest on the part of Western, the public, organizations, or agencies.

Table 3.1-1 Substantive Comments

Topic	Number of Comments
Access and Transportation	71
Agriculture	295
Air Quality	0
Alternatives	460
Aquatic Species and Habitats	0
Climate	0
Cumulative Effects	98
Electrical Characteristics	72
Environmental Justice	11
Fiber-optic Cable	1
Floodplains and Wetlands	20
Generation	37
Geology	0
Hazardous Materials and Solid Waste	2
Health and Safety	113
Historic and Cultural Resources	16
Land Use	191
Mitigation	4
Noise	15
Process	114
Public Involvement	337
Radio or Television Interference	18
Recreation	18
Residential	263
Rights-of-Way Acquisition	65
Social and Economic Values	195
Soils	44
Special Status Species	6
Vegetation	31
Visual Resources	81
Water	27
Weeds	26
Wildlife, Wildlife Habitat, and Migratory Birds	45
Total	2,871*

* The total number of substantive comments is less than the sum of the comments for individual topics because some comments addressed more than one topic.

3.2 Comment Categories

Once all comments were compiled, entered into the database, and organized by topic, Western placed the comments into one of six categories based on how they will be addressed in the EIS. Within each category and topic, Western summarized the individual comments into a set of statements that will be used to define the scope of the discussion for each topic in the EIS. The categories include:

- **Comments on Topics to be Considered in the EIS.** Western will consider the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the project, including appropriate mitigation for each of the resource topics in EIS.
- **Topics to be Considered as Cumulative Effects.** Comments in this category will be considered in developing the discussion of cumulative effects in the EIS. This section does not include comments on Tri-State's generation projects.
- **Comments on Tri-State's Generation.** Western will consider comments in this category to develop a discussion of cumulative effects in the EIS that is specific to Tri-State's generation projects.
- **Comments on Interconnection of Renewable Energy Sources.** Western will address comments regarding energy alternatives in the cumulative effects section of the EIS.
- **Comments on Process and Public Involvement.** Western will consider comments in this category in NEPA and public involvement activities to the extent that they are applicable to Western's NEPA process for this project.
- **Comments on Proposed and Alternative Corridors and Routes.** Comments in this category apply to specific alternatives and routing considerations. Western will consider these comments in refining the alternative routes, leading up to the proposed and alternative routes that will be described in the EIS.

3.3 Comments on Topics to be Considered in the EIS

Western has organized the comments, which relate to the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the EPTP, into resource topics as presented below. Western will address the comments under each resource topic in the EIS. Comments on the effects of other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable projects, including Tri-State's proposed generation, are discussed in subsequent sections of this report.

3.3.1 Access and Transportation

- Analyze direct, indirect, and cumulative effects on roadways and transportation during construction and operation, including sedimentation, airborne particulates, access, travel management, traffic congestion, and enforcement.
- Discuss landing strip/airport conflicts such as arriving and departing flights, emergency aircraft flights, and agricultural spraying flights.

- Minimize traffic on private property and prevent access of unauthorized surveyors, construction crews, project staff, and public to rights-of-way (ROWs) on private lands.
- Consider the number of vehicles including construction and maintenance equipment, and the trips per day in the project area during construction and operation of the project.
- Consider that access and transportation in some areas, especially south of I-70, can be difficult because of rough terrain, topographic features, sandy soils, and erosion risk.
- Evaluate proposed road improvements, new road construction, increased access, travel management, and enforcement. Consideration should be given to use of asphalt or concrete for new roadways instead of dirt or gravel and the effects of new road construction on land use.
- Consider conflicts with existing and planned roadways and other transportation corridors, such as the Prairie Falcon Parkway Express, Ports to Plains toll road, and the proposed Albuquerque- Denver- Cheyenne rail corridor.
- Consider access and road closure from inclement weather including snow, ice, and wind.
- Consider using existing road ROWs as transmission line corridors and access points during construction and operation of the project.
- Restrict access over sensitive land such as native grassland, native prairie, conservation easements, special state lands, wildlife habitat, wetlands, floodplains, and wet and soggy or sandy soils.
- Consider field damage from ROW access locations.

3.3.2 Agriculture

- Analyze the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to agriculture and agricultural operations including irrigation systems, farmland, rangeland, prime irrigated farmland, livestock, crop production, crop loss, crop production centers, pastures, access to farmland, farm characteristics, farm values, planting and harvest seasons, livestock grazing, and damage caused during construction.
- Discuss safety of livestock and other domestic animals (cattle, sheep, horses, and hogs).
- Effects caused by transmission lines crossing center pivot irrigation, watering systems, electric fences, pastures, ponds, springs, wells, livestock ranges, grain bins, grain elevators, feedlots, homesteads, houses, farm buildings, corrals, feedlots, harvestores, grain bins, and farm headquarters.
- Difficulty farming around transmission line poles (especially when several lines are adjacent) and inability to use farm machinery, crop dusters, aerial applicators, spray planes, pesticides, and herbicides leading to crop loss or damage.
- Economic viability and decreasing land value of farms and ranches, farmland, and rangeland, including the decline of crop production, productive farmland, and the local agricultural economy.

- Consider the effects of construction on agricultural land including damage to crops and fields, muddy or flooded fields, and weed infestation. Implement mitigation measures such as revegetation, dust control and avoiding use of heavy equipment on crops and fields, muddy or flooded fields, and agricultural land.
- Consider alternative routes for the transmission lines and alternatives to steel transmission towers to eliminate interference with ranching operations.
- Consider avoiding fragmenting large tracts of cultivated fields, dryland farming areas, farmland used for research, active and prime irrigated farmland, historically valued farmland, rangeland, pastureland, and productive agricultural land.
- Consider siting transmission lines on grazing land, rangeland, pastureland and section lines, existing utilities, and roads instead of active farmland.
- Effects on organic farming practices.
- Effects on agricultural tourism such as loss of revenue and visual resources. Agricultural tourism includes but is not limited to ranch tours, trail riding, guest cattle drives, bird watching, hunting, wildlife and scenic photography, and “real” ranching experiences.
- Consider interruption to agricultural operations like irrigation during power outages and surges.
- Prefer using rangeland to farmland because the ROW acquisition will cost less and cattle can easily graze around a tower.
- Consider annual reimbursement for interruption of agricultural operations, crop loss, crop damage, and difficulty farming around towers.
- Leave adequate space around transmission lines to maneuver farm equipment, about 60 to 140 feet.
- Assess and mitigate long-term effects of the project and reasonably foreseeable future projects to family-owned agricultural lands and the natural resources they support.
- Financial compensation should be provided to mitigate long-term impacts to agricultural operations, agricultural lands, and the natural resources they support.
- Analyze the effects of the projects and other reasonably foreseeable future projects on the continued viability of agricultural operations.
- Consider creating buffers and minimum distances between proposed transmission lines and existing transmission lines to allow farm equipment to maneuver between structures.

3.3.3 Air Quality

- Analyze direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to air quality.
- Effects from construction and roadway use including fuel use, vehicle emissions, air toxics, hazardous air pollutants, visibility, and particulates.

- Analysis of effects by airsheds rather than political boundaries.
- Dust control measures.

3.3.4 Aquatic Species and Habitats

- Analyze direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to aquatic wildlife and habitats.
- The EIS should show the extent to which aquatic habitat could be impaired by potential activities, including effects on surface and subsurface water quality and quantity, aquatic biota, stream structure and channel stability, streambed substrate including seasonal and spawning habitats, large organic material supplies (woody debris), stream bank vegetation and riparian habitats, and the overall physical integrity of aquatic ecosystems.

3.3.5 Cultural and Historic Resources

- Analyze direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to tribal and cultural resources such as human remains, archeological items, significant historic properties, and Native American Graves, dwellings, cultural and historic sites.
- Analyze potential effects on the Sand Creek Massacre Site.
- Consult with Colorado and Kansas State Historical Preservation Officers, Tribal Nations, tribal databases, and the Colorado Historical Society.
- Avoid historically valuable land, agricultural land, ranches, campsites, artifacts, homesteads, fire pits, teepee rings, trails, and stage stops.
- Avoid the Centennial Ranch, Belview School House, and the Santa Fe Trail.
- Avoid the bluffs in Brush that contain Mastodon tusks and other artifacts.

3.3.6 Electrical Characteristics and Radio and Television Interference

- Describe transmission line proximity to and effects on other electrical systems and utilities such as electric and regular fences, irrigation wells, pipes and booms, water and gas pipelines, automatic sprinklers, grain elevators, radio, internet connections, television, two-way radios, cell phones, satellite GPS, computers used in agricultural equipment, instrument panels, spray planes, tractors, combines, farm equipment, railroad operations, residences, large metal farm structures, and buildings with metal roofs.
- Consider health and safety concerns for humans, domestic animals, livestock, and wildlife from exposure to power lines and electric and magnetic fields (EMF).
- Describe any policies or guidelines in Colorado for EMF levels of newly constructed transmission lines.
- Consider the effects to other transmission lines, lower voltage transmission lines, and local distribution systems such as IREA. Consider interference, carrying capacity, and proximity.

- Consider the effects of power outages, surges, and other electrical interruptions caused by inclement weather or system failure on transmission system reliability and agricultural operations.
- Consider the effects of stray voltage and static electricity discharge including ground vibrations, health and safety, and impacts to vegetation.
- Describe the ground clearance of the high voltage transmission lines.
- Avoid increasing voltage on the lines.
- Consider the effects of electric and magnetic fields on water sources for humans, domestic animals, and livestock including wells, hydrants, and metal water pipes.
- Consider the “Box Canyon” effect caused by multiple lines surrounding one area.
- Consider Broadband over Power Lines (BPL) on the EPTP.

3.3.7 Environmental Justice

- Analyze direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to rural, low-income communities, low population rural farming communities, housing, schools, and labor force.
- Describe relative effects to rural and urban areas including loss of large parcels of land and undeveloped environmental conditions.
- Discuss distribution of wealth and profit of the proposed project.
- Siting criteria unfairly discriminates against historic agricultural land and long-term ranching families in favor of more recent residential development and land uses that created the need for additional power transmission.
- Colorado should not withhold access to landowners land and property.
- The project encroaches on landowners rights by affecting their rural lifestyle.
- Provide the documented evaluation of environmental justice to the general public.
- The proposed project excludes Baca County, Colorado, giving them no chance to improve the socioeconomics of their county, helping to create more low income households.
- ROW acquisition for the project creates an unconstitutional taking of property.

3.3.8 Floodplains and Wetlands

- Analyze direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to floodplains and wetlands, including waters of the U.S., wetlands, farmed wetlands, prior converted wetlands, forested wetlands, fens, draws, ephemeral wetlands, playa lakes, flooded and muddy fields, surface water, water quality and supply, aquatic and terrestrial habitat, channel and bank stability, flood storage, ground water recharge and discharge, sources of primary production, recreation, and aesthetics.

- Consider protection of hydrologic processes, aquatic ecosystems, and functioning riparian areas.
- The EIS should include a wetlands mitigation plan and should incorporate the 404 permitting process.
- Replacement/mitigation of affected and drained wetlands is requested, as well as details on mitigation banks, or other similar compensation programs.
- Delineate and mark perennial seeps and springs and wetlands before development activities, and establish buffer zones to avoid adverse effects.
- Wetland restoration is preferred to wetland creation and enhancement because it has a higher rate of success.
- Consider wetlands and floodplains as designated critical habitats of the Kansas state threatened green toad (*Bufo debilis*), Arkansas darter, and tiger salamander.
- Adhere to Executive Order 1, 1990, "Protection of Wetlands" and the interim goal of "No Overall Net Loss of the Nation's Remaining Wetlands" by making a mitigation commitment to avoid disturbances if at all possible.
- Describe the effects to wetland conservation easements, and Wetlands Reserve Programs.
- Consider the effects of construction activities on wetlands, floodplains, draws, and boggy and flooded fields. Avoid using heavy equipment over wetlands, floodplains, draws, and boggy and flooded fields.

3.3.9 Geology

- Analyze area geology, topography, soils, and stream stability in terms of erosion and mass failure potential to adequately portray the potential risk to resources from the implementation of specific alternatives.
- Consider the effects of construction on topographic features such as steep hills, bluffs, and rough terrain.

3.3.10 Hazardous Materials and Solid Waste

- Analyze the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of unintentional contaminant leaks and exposure to hazardous materials.
- Discuss the likelihood and frequency of hazardous material spills and response capabilities.
- Identify all hazardous materials that will be used at project sites, the amount that is used and stored, and the mode of transport.
- Using single poles instead of towers will create less waste during construction.
- Avoid chemical depots and areas where flammable chemicals are used.

- Describe the cleanup measures taken after project closure.

3.3.11 Health and Safety

- Analyze direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to human health, public health, future public health, livestock, and domestic animals caused by air pollution, EMF, mass failure, natural catastrophes, erosion, static electricity, and stray current.
- Consider safety of agricultural operations and other activities near and under transmission lines including using large farm machinery, aerial spraying, and flammable chemicals.
- Consider the effects of high voltage lines on drinking water for humans, livestock, and domestic animals.
- Consider and mitigate effects of electrical and magnetic fields on sensitive humans including individuals with existing illness, children, and the elderly.
- Mitigate aircraft and powerline collisions and consider safety concerns at local airports including clearance of arriving and departing planes.
- Provide evidence that high voltage is not a health hazard.
- Mitigate health and safety concerns of human and public health, domestic animals, livestock, and wildlife.
- Consider and mitigate the health and safety concerns of residents during inclement weather including emergency response time to falling towers and cables, and stray voltage transfer to standing water.
- Consider the effects to the safety of recreational areas including hunting grounds.
- Consider safety considerations during construction.
- Avoid residences, homes, homesteads, high-density residential development, future home sites, and highly populated areas.
- Design ROW wide enough to accommodate falling structures.

3.3.12 Land Use

- Analyze direct, indirect, and cumulative effects and mitigation plans for land use including conflicts with Federal, state, public, and private land; state parks, recreational use areas; conservation easements; current and future land use, including residential, subdivided, leased, commercial, and industrial; existing utility corridors and ROWs; existing and proposed wind farms; agriculture and ranching; and transportation including airports, railroads, and highways.
- Avoid conservation easements, Conservation Reserve Program, state lands, Colorado Natural Heritage Program land, Stewardship Trust Lands, and state and national parks including Blackwolf Creek, Colorado Peaks to Prairie, the Fountain Creek Crown Jewel Conservation Program, Quivira National Wildlife Refuge, Cimarron National Grassland,

Steek Fork Pheasants, LLC State Park, and large tracts of preserved agricultural land and native grassland.

- Consider traditional and historic land-use patterns.
- Avoid areas with the potential for sustainable development in the future.
- Consider single pole construction instead of towers to decrease the area of land used and allow farm machinery to be maneuvered between poles. Leave 60 to 140 feet between structures and section lines to maneuver farm equipment.
- Consider the conflict with the proposed Ports to Plains toll road and the Prairie Falcon Parkway Express toll road.
- Follow field and section lines, county roads, and highways, and use sparsely settled and unpopulated areas for the project.
- Avoid land with special uses including the Plainview School, Bohart Ranch, Metro Wastewater's research agricultural land, construction and demolition disposal sites, chemical depots, unique residences, and land with existing utility corridors.
- Choose the shortest route to mitigate land use impacts.
- Avoid residences, homes, homesteads, areas of high-density residential development, future home sites, and highly populated areas.
- Use existing ROWs to site the project.
- Do not allow any other entity to use a purchased ROW.
- Describe land uses compatible with transmission lines.
- Do not impose one easement on two landowners.
- Assess easement values based on the value of properties before the project was proposed. Consider past, current, and future land and property values. Make sure landowners are compensated for current property values.
- Consider the cumulative effects of utilities projects on land use (amount of ground space taken up by easements and lines).
- Western's EIS must address cumulative effects of possible conflicts between the proposed action and the objectives of Federal, regional, state, and local land use plans, policies, and controls for the areas concerned.

3.3.13 Noise

- Analyze direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of noise from construction and operation of the project.
- Discuss the potential for short and long-term noise pollution.
- Provide details of mitigation measures that will be implemented to reduce effects from noise.

- Conduct baseline noise monitoring.
- Include electrical noise from the transmission lines and substations.
- Consider noise that may be above or below the human range of hearing and its effects to wildlife, livestock, and domestic animals.
- Describe the noise released by the transmission lines in normal and inclement weather including volume level, changes in volume level, and other noise characteristics.
- Consider the noise produced by loose insulators rattling.

3.3.14 Paleontology

- Western received no comments specifically related to paleontology.

3.3.15 Recreation

- Analyze direct, indirect, and cumulative effects on recreational activities and areas including hunting and fishing, ranch tours, trail riding, guest cattle drives, bird watching, wildlife and scenic photography, horseback riding, hiking, visual character, scenic resources, aesthetics, and functional quality of recreational areas.
- Provide details of mitigation measures to reduce intrusion into recreational areas.

3.3.16 Social and Economic Values

- Analyze direct, indirect, and cumulative effects on social and economic values including property and land values, home and building values, local businesses, rural areas and communities, loss of residential development potential, loss of land, noxious weeds, difficulty of farming, mineral interests, cultivated fields, high value farm and agricultural land, loss of agricultural productivity, loss of crops, visual resources, local economic drivers, local housing, workforce, schools, and quality of life.
- Discuss devaluation and loss of productive prime irrigated and dry land farmland and associated economic changes to communities.
- Assess the general economics of the project including benefits, opportunity costs, cost effectiveness, and effects on workers, schools, and housing.
- Analyze effects of eminent domain on economic viability of farms and ranches and monetary compensation for such damages.
- Baca County and Tribune, Kansas have been excluded from the project, causing the loss of potential benefits to the county from the project.
- Financial compensation should be provided to individuals to mitigate short and long-term effects to agricultural land, land with historical and cultural value, natural resources, property and land values, mineral interest, and visual resources.
- Financial compensation should be provided to cover damages to property caused by construction, core drilling, survey crews, and environmental impact studies.

- Route the project to avoid rural communities and assess effects to the rural lifestyle.
- Consider increase in rates for locally provided electrical service.
- Consider landowner rights and the need for additional power transmission. It is unreasonable and unethical to ask only some families to absorb all the effects of the project.
- Provide research and statistics for loss of property values.
- Assess easement values based on the value of properties before the project was proposed. Consider past, current, and future land and property values.
- New transmission lines in no way benefit the landowners or the areas they live in the project area.
- New transmission lines will create rural development, new jobs, and better public relations.
- Towers are not cost effective over time.
- Short and direct routes and routes through rangeland will cost less to construct and acquire easements than long, indirect routes through active farmland.
- Describe the ROW and damage payment processes.
- Work with landowners to provide fair compensation for ROWs.
- Provide compensation for the loss of future development potential including residential and transportation development.

3.3.17 Soils

- Analyze direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to soils, erosion, mass failure potential, exposed soils, muddy unstable clays, sand dunes, sandy soils, blowouts, and sandhills from construction, access roads, and wind and water erosion.
- Consider existing erosion of sandy soils caused by utility projects including transmission lines, water lines, and crude oil lines.
- Consider current and future reclamation and mitigation efforts. Control erosion during and after construction and work with landowners to re-vegetate.
- Discuss erosion hazard to water resources.
- Assess difficulty of reclamation in sandy soils, especially with drought conditions.
- Avoid transportation and construction using heavy equipment on highly erodible and unstable soils and use areas of heavier and more stable soils.

3.3.18 Special Status Species

- Analyze direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to Endangered Species Act (ESA) listed threatened, endangered, proposed, or candidate species; state-listed species; sensitive

and other special status species; designated critical habitats; crucial wildlife habitats; and any other species in need of conservation.

- Habitat loss and threat to the lesser prairie chicken (*Tympanuchus pallidicinctus*), green toad (*Bufo debilis*), Topeka shiner (*Notropis Topeka*), sandhill cranes (*Grus canadensis*), piping plover (*Charadrius melodus*), western snowy plover (*Charadrius alexandrinus*), mountain plover (*Charadrius montanus*), bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*), ferruginous hawk (*Buteo regalis*), American peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus anatum*), tiger salamander (*Ambystoma tigrinum*), Arkansas darter (*Etheostoma cragini*), and greater sage grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*).
- Provide “buffer zones” around specific critical areas.
- Inventory and analyze the effects to habitat for special status species: any high quality or locally and regionally rare habitats or plant communities, such as remnant prairies, native vegetation, cacti, grassland, riparian areas, wetlands, and playa lakes.
- Mitigation for loss of any special status species or habitats should be identified.
- Prefer not to cross major tracts of native grassland where lesser prairie chickens have been documented.
- Avoid areas of proposed grassland restoration near Holcomb.

3.3.19 Vegetation

- Analyze direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to vegetation, including habitat for terrestrial and aquatic life, sources of primary production, designated critical habitat, native grassland, crucial wildlife habitat, area ecology, Federal and state sensitive plants, invasive plants and weeds, stream bank vegetation, native prairie, wetland and riparian vegetation, high quality or locally and regionally rare plant communities, remnant prairie, forested or treed areas, ongoing or planned forest or tree reclamation areas, and all local crops and vegetation.
- Inventory and mitigation for rare vegetation and habitats.
- Analyze sources of noxious weeds, effects from and management of noxious weeds, compensation for noxious weed management by landowners.
- Create mitigation plan that includes and considers reclamation activities, avoidance of large contiguous tracts of grassland and native prairie, create 100-foot buffers of native vegetation around project components, tree replacement, and time construction to avoid disturbing plants during crucial seasons in their life cycle.
- Consider that even slight disturbances can cause invasive weeds to grow under the towers and become a harbor for invasive weeds and insect pests like grasshoppers.
- The project impairs aerial spraying practices for weed control and should consider reimbursement to landowners for damage to crops and loss of productivity.

- Create a mitigation plan for invasive weed infestation that includes constructing physical barriers around tower bases, and laying gravel. Consider mitigation methods that are conducive to organic farming practices.
- Western and Tri-State should be responsible for managing and eradicating invasive weeds in the ROW.
- Consider the effects of electrical and magnetic fields on vegetation during times of high moisture and drought.
- Physical effects of construction on grassland and native grassland including erosion, compaction, and invasive weeds.
- Avoid central shortgrass prairie, prairie grassland, cacti, native grasses, sandhill grasses, sandsage shrubland and habitat, and grassland restoration areas.
- Prefer using grassland to cropland.
- Consider using single pole to towers because it is easier to control invasive weeds.

3.3.20 Visual Resources

- Analyze direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to visual resources including viewsheds from major and scenic roadways, homes, farmsteads, pastures, wetland aesthetics, light pollution, effects out of character with the setting, and construction, operation and maintenance equipment and crews.
- Include skyline visual effects.
- Describe aesthetics of undisturbed topography and scenic residential views.
- Discuss visibility effects and air quality effects from dust.
- Assess potential for light pollution at night from substations.
- Reduce visibility from the I-25 corridor.
- Analyze the effects of visual resources on property values.
- How would effects to visual resources affect recreation activities including scenic photography, hiking, agricultural tourism, climbing, bird watching?
- How would effects to visual resources affect businesses such as agricultural tourism?
- Mitigate effects to visual resources by siting transmission lines behind topographic features or in valleys.
- How would effects to visual resources affect a town or community, including the success or failure of local real estate markets?

3.3.21 Water

- Analyze direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to water resources (groundwater, surface water, drinking water, municipal water sources, streams, rivers, tributaries, perennial seeps, and springs) including quality, quantity, drinking water sources, adjacent water basins, aquifers, culverts for water drainage, dams, pipes, hydrants, wells, wildlife habitat, hydrologic processes, contaminants in water, water demands, functioning riparian areas, water quality parameters (conductivity, dissolved and suspended solids, metals, pH, temperature, dissolved oxygen).
- Reduction of non-point source pollution using best management practices.
- Interaction of wells and irrigation with transmission line structures, including well maintenance.
- Impaired designated uses and water quality standards.
- Stormwater management including flooding and runoff.
- Effects of transmission line foundations on groundwater, aquifers, water table.
- Mitigate water crossings.
- Adhere to Executive Order 1, 1990, "Protection of Wetlands", and the Clean Water Act.
- Create a mitigation plan that includes restoring and maintaining water quality and hydrological processes.
- Provide accurate descriptions of surface and ground water resources and identify affected watersheds on maps before development activity.
- Obtain and provide water rights to all water resources used in the project and make this information public.
- Analyze affects by watershed instead of by political boundaries.
- Consider the effects on water resources and water rights used for agricultural uses.

3.3.22 Wildlife

- Analyze direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to wildlife and habitats, physical and biological complexity, crucial wildlife habitat, the prairie ecosystem as a whole, and breeding and nesting activities.
- Consider the displacement of wildlife, habitat fragmentation, and the importance of nesting areas, feeding areas, wintering areas, and flyways to wildlife.
- Effects of transmission lines and towers on birds including collision and electrocution. Consider a mitigation plan that includes phosphorescent markers on power lines to improve visibility to birds.
- Avoid flyways in eastern Arapahoe County.

- Effects to specific species including population statistics for dove, ducks, raccoons, wild turkey, owls, hawks, predatory birds, raptors, snow geese, Canada geese, cranes, sparrow hawks, quail, deer, antelope, elk, and horned lizards, waterfowl, eagles, sandhill cranes, western meadowlarks, western horned larks, lark buntings, loggerhead shrikes, common flicker, brown-headed cowbird, many different kinds of sparrows, mourning doves, western box turtles, several different types of snakes, lizards, fox, coyotes, mule deer, white tailed deer, pronghorn antelope, black tailed jack rabbit, cotton tail rabbit, striped skunk, badger, killdeer (plover), great blue heron, night heron, night hawk, different butterflies, bees, yellow headed blackbird, ring-neck pheasant, great horned owl, short eared owl, screech owl, oriole, gold finch, juncos, kangaroo rat, American kestrel, falcons, bobwhite quail, turkey vulture, Wilson's phalarope, common snipe, sandpipers, long-billed curlew, American avocet, cattle egret, American coot, willet, frogs, toads, tiger salamander, gopher, 13-lined ground squirrel, Eastern and Western king birds, grackle, red-winged blackbird, crow, mockingbird, thrasher, mountain blue-bird, and barn swallows.
- Maintain integrity of playa lakes, intermittent ponds, draws, wildlife dams, wetlands, and streams as they are important habitat or stopover points for migrating water fowl.
- Comply with Federal and state game and fish wildlife management objectives, and consider wildlife mortality.
- Mitigate effects to wildlife and wildlife habitat.
- Avoid fragmenting large areas of wildlife habitat with access roads and construction effects.
- Analyze to effects of EMF on wildlife.
- Identify "Potential Conservation Areas" by contacting the Colorado Natural Heritage Program.
- Consider effects to recreational activities that involve wildlife including hunting, bird watching, wildlife photography and agricultural tourism.
- Multiple transmission lines will have negative effects to birds in their feeding area.

3.4 Topics to be Considered as Cumulative Effects

Comments in this category will be considered in developing the discussion of cumulative effects in the EIS. Comments related to cumulative effects to specific resources have been included in the previous section. Comments specific to Tri-State's generation projects are discussed in Section 3.5.

3.4.1 Conflicts with Existing Utilities and Transmission Lines

- Consider the cumulative effects of multiple existing and proposed transmission lines on one landowner's property and near residences.
- Avoid cumulative effects of cutting through farmland with numerous overhead utility lines including high-voltage power lines, cellular towers, and underground city and domestic water lines, sewer lines, irrigation pipelines and wells, pump stations, oil and gas lines, and public works projects like highways, county roads, etc.
- Three miles south of Sharon Springs is a conglomeration of already existing transmission lines and underground public and private gas lines, city water lines, domestic water lines, and crude oil lines that prohibit the building of any permanent structure on the ROW.
- Avoid properties with existing utilities projects such as Mobile Gas, Bittercreek Gas, Xcel Energy, and Unocal.
- Avoid siting multiple EPTP transmission line routes on one landowner's property.

3.4.2 Conflicts with Reasonably Foreseeable and Other Future Projects

- Consider the cumulative impacts of reasonably foreseeable future projects within the project area including the Peak to Prairie Land Conservation Initiative, the Fountain Creek Crown Jewel Project in El Paso and Pueblo counties, Xcel Energy proposed transmission lines, the Falcon Prairie Toll Road, Rocky Mountain Rail Authority Albuquerque- Denver- Cheyenne rail corridor, Invenergy, LLC Squirrel Creek Energy Center, the Southern Delivery Water Project (Colorado Springs Utilities/Bureau of Reclamation), the LaFarge West, Inc. Gravel Pit and Concrete Batch Plant, Unocal Gas Storage Project, the relocation and widening of Highway 27 in Sherman County, Kansas, and the Ports-to-Plains Trade Corridor.
- Consider the cumulative impacts of other future project within the project area that have not yet been planned including public works and utilities projects, additional transmission corridors and energy development, proliferation of the Eastern Plains Transmission Project, and general commercial, residential and industrial development of the Front Range, Eastern Colorado, and Western Kansas.

3.5 Comments on Tri-State's Generation

Western will consider comments in this category to develop a discussion of cumulative effects in the EIS specific to Tri-State's generation projects. The comments related to Tri-State's generation projects are summarized by topic because of the large number of comments that apply to specific resources or components of these projects.

3.5.1 Access and Transportation

- Effects on local traffic flow during construction and operation of generation facility.
- Effects on railroad activity delivering coal to Holcomb and Garden City, Kansas generation facilities.

- Proposed upgrades and maintenance to local infrastructure including roadways and railways.
- Alternative transportation routes for vehicles carrying hazardous materials.
- Total and effects of daily train trips.
- Locate the proposed power plant near the source of the coal used for easy access.

3.5.2 Agriculture

- Effects to crops, farmland, and agriculture caused in any way by generation projects, including air emissions and changes in water use.
- Assess effects to crops within 500 miles of power plants in terms of the aggregate of lost value-per-year and remediation cost-per-year.
- Loss of productive agricultural land when water is sold from the land for use in coal-fired power plants.
- Assess the amount in tons-per-year or pounds-per-year of increased deposition of various pollutants on each highly agricultural region in the United States.

3.5.3 Air Quality

- Effects on air quality during the following phases: 1) construction, 2) start-up, 3) operation, and 4) shut-down.
- Air quality assessments including Class I increment and Class II Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD).
- Potential effect on all criteria pollutants under the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), including ozone, visibility impairment, and air quality related values (AQRV) in the protection of any affected Class I areas, significant concentrations of hazardous air pollutants, and protection of public health.
- Effects to human health, wildlife, and agriculture from air quality issues, including but not limited to mercury and dioxin toxicity in fish eaten by humans caused by increased emission from coal burning power plants.
- The results of air quality modeling consistent with EPA and Kansas Department of Health and Environment guidelines.
- The amount, in tons-per-year or pounds-per-year, of specific emissions of carbon dioxide, methane, mercury, atmospheric sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, sulfur trioxides, particulate matter/particulate matter 10 microns or less, sulfuric acid mist, fluorides, dust particulates, hazardous air pollutants (HAPs), and any potential air toxics.
- Air pollution control measures and devices including coal washing, Best Available Control Technology (BACT) limits, Maximum Available Control Technology (MACT), sulfur dioxide scrubbers, mercury emissions controls, etc.

- Schematics of the air pollution control system including carbon and mercury capture, bypass of the pollution control system, and conditions under which bypass will occur, activated carbon injection, fabric filters with FGD control, circulating dry scrubbers, drift eliminators, coal washing, and circulating fluidized bed technology.
- Dust control methods for storage piles, conveyors, crushers, pulverizers, and storage bins.
- Mitigation of significant deterioration of air quality near the plant, such as emission offsets, coal washing, and Adaptive Resource Management.

3.5.4 Alternatives to Supercritical Pulverized Coal-Fired Generation

- Alternatives to supercritical pulverized coal-fired generation, including studies on supply-side options such as integrated gasification combined cycle coal (IGCC) generation, natural gas, wind, solar, biomass, and demand-side options such as energy conservation.
- The quantity of renewable energy to be developed by Tri-State for delivery on the EPTP including the megawatts, megawatt hours, and the types of renewables, construction dates, locations, and operations timelines.
- Consider modeling on concentrating solar power, wind energy, biomass, and IGCC generation.
- Consider and assess the energy resource alternatives to coal-burning power plants including conservation, renewable energy sources (solar, wind, biomass, hydroelectric), and cleaner methods of fossil fuel generation. Also consider incentives for home and business photovoltaic systems. In the assessment, include dollar costs, environmental costs, and national security costs.
- Costs and socioeconomic benefits of wind energy, biomass, and gas-fired resources including pollution trade-offs. Using alternative energy sources benefits communities.
- Consider peer-reviewed studies indicating “as much as 98 percent of the capital stock of US fossil power plants would need to be replaced with state-of-the-art carbon dioxide capture and storage (CCS)-enabled power plants by the year 2050.”
- The relative efficiencies of long-distance transmission of electricity versus local, decentralized electricity generation; use alternative energy sources and localized transmission to power the Front Range instead of long distance transmission.
- Financial analysis of project alternatives.
- Energy requirements and conservations potential of various project alternatives.
- Why was only one power source for project the basis for economical, reliable, diverse, and flexible power delivery system.

- Consider the proposal to build the Grand Mesa Project on the Western Slope to provide additional storage on Surface Creek and generate an average of 52 million kilowatt-hours annually.

3.5.5 Climate

- Include climate change considerations in the EIS.
- Amounts of greenhouse gas emissions, such as methane, nitrous oxide, and carbon dioxide, and how they will affect global warming.
- Effects of atmospheric sulfur dioxide producing sulfuric acid and formation of atmospheric fog/haze during time of winter air inversions in the regional valleys.
- Consider and model drought and global warming projections in regards to water use.
- Mitigation measures such as Carbon dioxide capture and storage (CCS) technology.

3.5.6 Cultural and Historic Resources

- Consult with the State Historic Preservation Officer and any Indian Tribe regarding mitigation of effects to significant historic properties.

3.5.7 Cumulative Effects

- Assess all cumulative effects related to Tri-States three new coal units and coal consumption and combustion.

3.5.8 Environmental Justice

- Effects on minority and low income populations in all resource categories.
- Jobs that could be created in rural areas through renewable energy generation and coal generation.
- Where the electricity generated by these projects will be used.
- Factual finding as to whether the following communities fit the definition of an environmental justice community: Holcomb, Garden City, Lamar, Las Animas, La Junta, Pueblo, and any other affected community not listed here.

3.5.9 Construction and Operation of Facilities

- Conduct and make a detailed report of environmental and cultural effects for all communities in the immediate vicinity of proposed coal power plants.
- The effects to coal supplies and contracts and other fossil fuels resources to be used in Tri-State's generation.
- Potential future costs of pulverized coal generation plants if a carbon tax is enacted.
- The megawatt size of each unit, the number of units to be constructed, the summer and winter megawatt rating of each, the type of burner technology to be used in each unit, the type of emission controls to be used at each unit, tons of coal burned annually by each

unit of the plant, type of coal to be burned, heat rate of the coal burned, mercury content of the coal, ash content of the coal.

- Projected average plant capacity factor for each project.
- The location of storage piles and source of materials used in construction and operation of the coal fired power plant.
- All mobile equipment that will be used on site and annual fuel use.
- The line segment from Holcomb to Lamar would not be required if the power plant were not connected to the EPTP.

3.5.10 Hazardous Materials and Solid Waste

- All hazardous materials that will be used, stored, or transported at all project sites.
- The amount of waste (including, but not limited to ammonia, ash, scrubbers and hazardous waste), the disposal sites, and modes of transporting waste to disposal sites.
- Alternative transportation routes and disposal sites for all hazardous materials and other waste to avoid populated areas.
- MACT and BACT for hazardous wastes and emissions.

3.5.11 Health and Safety

- Human health effects of these coal-fired power plants.
- All epidemiological, clinical, and environmental health studies related to cumulative and synergistic exposure to hazardous and criteria pollutants emitted from the proposed coal plants.
- Emergency management plan, maintenance schedule, and traffic control plan for the coal-fired power plants.
- Explosion and fire hazard risks and mitigation for same, including monitoring equipment.
- Consider the lack of sufficient local medical facilities to address health effects to workers and local residents.
- The protection of public health.
- Analyze and develop mitigation for the cancer and non-cancer health effects from emissions and discharge.
- Analyze risk to human and ecological health from all criteria pollutants and exhaust from trucks, trains, and on site mobile equipment.

3.5.12 Land Use

- Effects to lands caused by the proposed coal plants.

3.5.13 Mitigation

- Analyze proposed use of Adaptive Resource Management (ARM).

3.5.14 Noise

- The potential effects of noise, including baseline noise monitoring.
- The effects of noise levels of steam blows and proposed and alternative noise reduction control measures.
- The projected peak and 1-hour average and maximum noise levels at the fence line of the coal plants in noise analyses.

3.5.15 Process and Public Involvement

- Request for Western to reissue a NOI to include three new coal plants as part of the scope of this project.
- Request that Tri-State swear under penalty of perjury that all information provided to the public as part of this process is complete and accurate.
- The scoping meetings too narrowly defined what people could comment on and failed to identify the proposed new coal plants.
- Western should disallow any future Tri-State involvement in public meetings. If, however, Tri-State continues to fulfill an official role in public meetings, the Coalition is requesting one as well.
- Provide information and updates on the planning, permitting, and approval process.

3.5.16 Social and Economic Values

- Socio-economic effects for all communities in the immediate vicinity of proposed coal power plants.
- Any proposals to mitigate effects to local infrastructure, including assistance to local agencies for infrastructure upgrades related to project construction and operations.
- Effects on medical costs and productivity on members of all affected communities.
- Financial effects of the proposed power plants on Tri-State's owners and the financial liability to each consumer.
- Locating the proposed power plant near the source of coal will reduce the cost required to transport it.
- Using alternative energy sources benefits communities.
- Provide information on who will be financing the power lines and power plants.

3.5.17 Special Status Species

- Effects to threatened and endangered species on and around the plant site and all related project components; for example, for increased deposition of various pollutants,

assessments of the amount, in tons-per-year or pounds-per-year, by which each pollutant would directly or indirectly increase the deposition on the habitats of threatened and endangered species—of each chemical, including but not limited to, mercury and dioxin.

3.5.18 Vegetation

- Consider the metal uptake by plants from emissions from the plant, specifically boron, fluorine, arsenic, and selenium.

3.5.19 Visual Resources

- Effects to visibility caused by emissions, and for decreased visibility in scenic areas, the hourly, daily, and annual assessments of visibility degradations caused by each project through performing visibility modeling for the maximum hourly average emissions and maximum 24-hour average emissions.
- Effects of light pollution.

3.5.20 Water

- Consider the total water consumption for all units of the project including a breakdown of individual uses including but not limited to cooling towers, blowdown water, scrubber, makeup to boilers, dust control, sanitary uses, and coal dust pile.
- Consider effects to existing wells, springs, wetlands, include detailed mitigation plans.
- For increased deposition of various pollutants, assess in tons-per-year or pounds-per-year each option would directly or indirectly increase the deposition on waters.
- Consider the “plumbing” of Tri-State’s proposed power plants, including well field locations, surface water PODs, location of spreading basins, and injection wells.
- Consider the amount and characteristics of any wastewater discharged from plant operation processes and during project constructions. Consider proposed and alternative discharge locations.
- Provide detailed breakdown of acre-feet water demand for each coal plant including construction and operation.
- Consider proposed and alternative water consumption rates and amounts to include an analysis of proposed and alternative recycling methods.
- Require adjudication of all water rights before issuance of DEIS.

3.5.21 Wildlife

- Describe wildlife populations that will be affected by water use of pulverized coal produced electricity.
- Provide measures to keep wildlife away from waste ponds, disposal sites, other relevant plant operation facilities and throughout all project construction activities.

- Develop mitigation strategies to avoid effects to wildlife, wildlife migration routes, and wildlife habitat.
- Consider measures for protecting water at the source for use by wildlife.

3.6 Comments on Interconnection of Renewable Energy Sources

Western will consider the comments below to develop the discussion of energy alternatives in the cumulative effects section of the EIS.

- Question whether wind, solar, or other forms of renewable energy generation from private and/or public owners can be connected to EPTP.
- Consider how the Montezuma Wind Farm, Crossing Trails Wind Power Project, Horizon Wind Energy, and other unspecified wind generation in Colorado, Kansas, Oklahoma, Baca County, Cheyenne, and Kit Carson counties can be integrated into the grid.
- Provide technical information to potential wind interconnection entities on logistics, operations, proximity to lines, and MW quantity.

3.7 Comments on Process and Public Involvement

Western will not address comments in this category in the EIS, but will consider them to help define future NEPA and public involvement activities to the extent that they are applicable to Western's NEPA process.

- Conduct careful and thorough environmental, natural resource, land use, and cultural resource investigations for all proposed and alternative routes.
- Consider Arapahoe County's "green printing" constraint mapping in the route analysis.
- Make all mitigation plans public information.
- Western should conduct all public meetings in a question and answer, open format with a facilitator and have all questions, comments, and answers recorded and transcribed.
- Consider and try to meet all of the needs of potentially effected landowners.
- Present the environmental effects of the proposal and alternatives in a comparative form, thus sharply defining the issues and providing a clear basis for choice among options by the decision maker and the public.
- Provide ongoing public involvement support and a staffed complaint hotline to address neighborhood problems such as noise, odor, dust, traffic, and vibration and a plan to resolve any identified problems.
- Provide public training and information on the permitting and NEPA process and schedule to all communities; especially designated environmental justice communities.

- Make independent experts available to the communities and other interested entities for review of permit applications, technical reports, and other project requirements and components.
- Provide detailed and accurate sheet maps to the public as well as specific and clear legal descriptions of affected land.
- Provide written notice to stakeholders for the project, public meetings, and Rights of Entry request.
- Provide Purpose and Need statements to the public.
- Follow the Arapahoe County 1041 Areas and Activities of State Interest permitting process for Major Facilities for a Public Utility.
- Follow Federal permitting process per Federal regulations and make the results public information.
- The EIS should consider all reasonable alternatives to overhead power lines.
- Include priorities for line construction in Chapter 2 of the EIS.
- Notify stakeholders and landowners of all surveying activities and field studies.
- Hold public meetings in locations accessible to all potentially affected landowners. If they are not accessible, provide transportation to those landowners.
- Provide information to the public on project components including voltage, height, distance between towers, number of towers, what kind of towers, appearance of towers and substations, how much land the substation will use, use of temporary construction easements, and where and how centerlines in corridors are chosen.
- Provide more time between meeting notification and public meetings. Provide more time to comment.
- General approval or disapproval of the project, eminent domain, condemnation and unwanted easements, access acquisition, ROWs, and compensation offered including the cost amount.
- Inform landowners of the entire ROW acquisition process.
- Describe the dimensions and land used for ROWs and access roads.
- Provide draft ROE and ROW contracts to landowners for review.
- Describe ownership of the ROW and transmission towers and lines.

3.8 Comments on Proposed and Alternative Corridors

Comments in this category apply to specific routing alternatives. Western will consider the comments to identify refinements to the proposed and alternative routes. Some of the general comments listed below are summarized from notes drawn on the sheet maps during

public meetings. Some of the route-specific comments also were taken from the sheet maps, including the minor route changes drawn on the sheet maps and transcribed here.

3.8.1 General Comments

General comments from the sheet maps included identifying property locations and land use. Several comments made general recommendations for selection of alternative routes for the EPTP. These recommendations include:

- Route transmission lines to avoid homes, schools, gas wells, the Garden City Western Railway tracks, center pivot irrigation systems, grain elevators, conservation easements, potential conservation areas, farms, farmland, hog farms, cattle farms, the Bohart Ranch, Frost Livestock Ranch, the Owl Canyon Property, visually valuable land, and native grassland or prairies.
- Build project away from residential areas, farmsteads, and developed and populated areas.
- Use existing linear features such as utility corridors and rights-of-way, existing transmission lines and rights-of-way, roads including the I-70 corridor, Highway 71 corridor, Highway 94 corridor, Highway 287 corridor, Highway 40 corridor, field lines, section lines, fence lines, grass lines, and railroads.
- Site transmission lines near wind farms to reduce land use effects.
- Avoid properties that already have transmission lines and other utilities projects.
- Use low value land for the project.
- Avoid spider-webbing out of substations.
- All feasible alternatives should be given equal consideration and analysis.
- Concern why Baca County is not included in the project.
- Avoid construction and operation of the project on sandy and erodible soils.
- Use single poles instead of towers because they are easier to farm around.
- Choose the shortest and most direct routes to save unnecessary construction, land use, and rights of way purchases.
- Prefer to have compaction and soil erosion from construction in fields rather than in native grass and grassland.
- The existing Beaver-Creek to Hoyt line needs to be removed.
- Combine routes when possible. Consider planning fewer routes and substations.
- Leave sufficient space to maneuver farm equipment between the towers and section lines and roads.
- Avoid cutting through the middle of farmland, fields, sections, and residential areas.

- Route the project on land that is uninhabited, large open ranch ranges, grazing land, and state land.
- Avoid and maintain emergency transportation routes.
- Consider involving additional counties in the project.
- Create more alternatives to choose from.
- Do not further change or switch the proposed and alternative routes after the public open house meetings.
- Consider reasonable alternatives to overhead transmission lines including underground transmission lines.
- Consider alternative sites for substations.
- Construct the project closer to the Front Range where the power will be used.
- Keep lines confined to as few ROWs as possible. Use existing ROWs.
- Provide additional alternative routes for the Boone to Midway and Midway to Big Sandy corridors.

3.8.2 Route-Specific Comments

Commenters made many location-specific comments on the preliminary alternative corridors introduced in the August and September 2006 scoping meetings and on the proposed and alternative routes introduced in the February public meetings. Western organized these comments by transmission line. Many of the comments are a reflection of landowner preferences and some conflict with others. Regardless, the analysis of the alternative transmission line routes to be carried into the EIS will include consideration of the comments, as well as other opportunities and constraints as routes are refined.

The comments on each transmission line are organized by comment period because each period had a specific set of transmission line routes that commenters reviewed. The first comment period discussed below contains comments received at scoping meetings in August and September 2006 through December 31, 2006. The second comment period discussed below includes comments made between January 1, 2007, and March 16, 2007; the primary sources of these comments were public meetings held in February 2007. Several of the routes between substations were relabeled for the sake of organization and consistency between comment periods.

3.8.2.1 Rolling Hills Substation to Energy Center Substation

The following comments on the segments between the Rolling Hills substation and the Energy Center substation were received between August 2 and December 31, 2006.

- Prefer B3, B7, and B12.
- Avoid B1 and B2.

- Prefer line stay west of Holcomb.
- Avoid B7 (home would sit between two lines one mile apart).
- B7 and A3 possibly affecting eight quarter sections with three large lines in 3 mile area.
- Move B4 to eastern border of section 30 (to avoid affecting scenic views).
- Prefers B9 to B5, B6, B7, and B8.
- Avoid Little Lowe Rd.
- Avoid B13.

Following the first set of scoping meetings, the segments between the Rolling Hills substation and the Energy Center substation were re-labeled from “B” to “A”. The following comments on the segments between the Rolling Hills substation and the Energy Center substation were received between January 1 and March 16, 2007.

- Prefer A1, A6, A7.
- Prefer A2 over A1.
- Avoid A4, A7.
- Avoid A1, A2, A10, this area is critical habitat to lesser prairie chickens.
- Move A6 and A7 along section lines.
- There is a proposed home site on A1.
- Reroute A1 to the east to avoid an existing transmission line.
- There are more residents along A1 than are shown on maps. There are fewer residents on A2 in that area.
- Move A2, A7, and A9 to avoid homes.
- A5 comes close to the trail by Syracuse.
- Route the A route along the B route until A could turn directly west to Lamar.

3.8.2.2 Rolling Hills Substation to Burlington Substation

The following comments on the segments between the Rolling Hills substation and the Burlington substation were received between August 2 and December 31, 2006.

- Prefers A1, A3, A5, A11, A12, A14, and A15.
- Avoid A11.
- Prefer A5 and A11 (stay west of Leoti).
- Move A9 and A10 1.5 to 2 miles to the west (to avoid residences).

Following the first set of scoping meetings, the segments between the Rolling Hills substation and the Burlington substation were re-labeled from “A” to “B”. The following comments on the segments between the Rolling Hills substation and the Burlington substation were received between January 1 and March 16, 2007.

- The Lamar line could branch off at the B5 point on the Rolling Hills to Burlington segment.
- Prefer the proposed route B11, B14, and B18.
- Prefer B11 to provide economic and social benefits to the community of Tribune, Kansas.
- Prefer B13 to B14 because it is over rangeland and pastureland.
- Avoid homes near B13.
- Reroute B14 to avoid a home and farm and to follow county line.
- Prefer B7 to B6.
- Prefer B8 to B6 to avoid surrounding one residence with multiple lines.
- Prefer B2 to B1 because it avoids farmland, rangeland.
- Avoid or reroute B7 because it is over farmland.
- Reroute B7 to go over farmland instead of over rangeland.
- Avoid B4 because it obstructs visual resources.
- Avoid B6; prefer no diagonal route (B6) between B5 and B7.
- Avoid B13 because it crosses native American campgrounds containing artifacts and fire pits.
- Prefer an alternative to B5 and B7 that routes through grassland.
- Relocate B18 to go through soil banks instead of farmable land.
- Reroute B10 and B12 to avoid Whitam Land & Cattle and route along section lines.
- Use alternative route B2, B3, B4, B9, B11, B14, B18, B20, B21 to avoid conflict with a private runway.
- Continuing segment B3 straight north would avoid numerous residents.
- Reroute B1 to avoid a proposed disposal site.
- Reroute B9 to follow roads and section lines.
- Reroute B18 to avoid wind farm and meteorological tower.
- Reroute B11 to follow section lines.
- Reroute B21 to follow section lines instead of bisecting a farm.

3.8.2.3 Energy Center Substation to Burlington Substation

The following comments on the segments between the Energy Center substation and the Burlington substation were received between August 2 and December 31, 2006.

- Avoid the Plainview School.
- Avoid hog farms.

The following comments on the segments between the Energy Center substation and the Burlington substation were received between January 1 and March 16, 2007.

- Prefer C5 and C7 because they do not obstruct visual resources.
- Prefer C2 or C3.
- Avoid cell tower near C2.
- Prefer C5 to C6 as it avoids homes, farmland, and the Penny Ranch.
- Avoid C2, C4, and C6.
- Avoid homes between C4 and C5.
- C4 crosses through the middle of farmed fields.
- Route C5 to run along section or range lines avoiding grain bins, irrigation, dry land farming, a gas well, and residences.
- Avoid home sites under C2, C4, and C6.
- Reroute C7 to avoid CRP land.
- Avoid historic town site and the Plainview school near C4.
- Avoid high gas line near C1.

3.8.2.4 Energy Center Substation to Lamar Substation

The following comments on the segments between the Energy Center substation and the Lamar substation were received between August 2 and December 31, 2006.

- Coordinate with irrigation district for canal crossings.

The following comments on the segments between the Energy Center substation and the Lamar substation were received between January 1 and March 16, 2007.

- Prefer D3 to D4.
- Avoid runways, hangers, and airstrips near D2, D3, and D4.
- Avoid water tank near D4.
- Reroute D2 to avoid homes and run along roads.
- Avoid aerial spraying strips north of Bristol, Colorado.

3.8.2.5 Energy Center Substation to Boone Substation

The following comments on the segments between the Energy Center substation and the Boone substation were received between August 2 and December 31, 2006.

- Avoid area south of US 287 (effects to sand hills include damage and erosion).
- Concerned about lines near reservoirs and wildlife areas affecting migratory birds, including threatened and endangered species.

The following comments on the segments between the Energy Center substation and the Boone substation were received between January 1 and March 16, 2007.

- Avoid E4 because it is over CRP land, highly erodible soils, and native grass.
- Use an alternative site for the Boone substation NE of the proposed site.
- Avoid homes and buildings near E6.
- Avoid well near E1.

3.8.2.6 Energy Center Substation to Big Sandy Substation

The following comments on the segments between the Energy Center substation and the Big Sandy substation were received between August 2 and December 31, 2006.

- Avoid G7 (passes by homes and raises health concern).
- Prefer G8 and G9 (soil less sandy and more stable).
- Prefer lines routed as far SE as possible.
- Avoid G7 north of Colorado Highway 94 (very sandy).
- Prefers to extend G8 and stay north of Wildhorse (harder soils) rather than use G4, G5, or G6.

Following the first set of scoping meetings, the segments between the Energy Center substation and the Big Sandy substation were re-labeled from "G" to "F". The following comments on the segments between the Energy Center substation and the Big Sandy substation were received between January 1 and March 16, 2007

- Prefer F3 to F2.
- Prefer F1 and F7.
- F7 has less erodible soil, and more level topography, and will require fewer towers than F8.
- The F line is the most direct route from Lamar to Limon and may have the least impacts.
- Follow the alternative route F5 to the point where it dissects County Road 2, and continue north to the point where it meets F7.
- Prefer F10 because it has little visual impact to homes and the Town of Limon.

- Reroute F10 along section lines.
- Move F7 north one mile to avoid state land.
- Follow the F5, F8 and F7 routes.
- Prefer F10 to F8, F9, and F11 because it does not encroach on arriving and departing flights at the Limon Airport.
- Reroute F1 to avoid cultivated land.
- Reroute F5, F7 to avoid homes.
- Avoid state/leased land near F4.
- Avoid cell tower near F3.
- Reroute F4 and F5 so they connect and follow the Lincoln/Cheyenne county road.
- Avoid Quonset bin and sandy hills and soils near F8.
- Avoid dam in Seven Mile Creek, house, corrals, and steel shed near F7.

3.8.2.7 Burlington Substation to Big Sandy Substation

The following comments on the segments between the Burlington substation and the Big Sandy substation were received between August 2 and December 31, 2006.

- Avoid I1 (snow loads, ice, and noxious weeds).
- Prefer I5.
- Prefer I1 and I2.
- Route line to the south of I-70 along existing line of H-frame structures on road 2W (much fewer homes).
- Avoid I5.
- Move I1 to the south (follow existing line).
- Prefer routing along existing 230-kV line.
- Route project to the south of I-70 to avoid residences, and gain less expensive and more accessible land, grassland, and less ice and snow.

Following the first set of scoping meetings, the segments between the Burlington substation and the Big Sandy substation were re-labeled from "I" to "G". The following comments on the segments between the Burlington substation and the Big Sandy substation were received between January 1 and March 16, 2007.

- Prefer G4 over G3 because it avoids farmland.
- Prefer G4 and G6.
- Avoid the route south of I-70 because of residential development.

- Avoid G3, avoid G4.
- Prefer G5 because it's on grassland, untillable land, it would cost less, and less people live near it.
- Prefer the proposed line.
- Prefer the southern most alternative because it has better access and uses an existing linear corridor.
- Prefer the route north of I-70 because it has heavier soil and less wind erosion.
- Avoid homes and future home sites near G3, G4, and G6.
- Reroute G4 to follow existing 230-kV line, and avoid a solar water well, agricultural land, CRP land, the Three Rivers Ranch and a pasture.
- Avoid crop, grassland, and homes near G5.
- Reroute G3 to avoid a runway.

3.8.2.8 Burlington Substation to Wray Substation

The following comments on the segments between the Burlington substation and the Wray substation were received between August 2 and December 31, 2006.

- Avoid feedlots between H5 and US 385.
- H2 less populated than H1.

The following comments on the segments between the Burlington substation and the Wray substation were received between January 1 and March 16, 2007.

- Prefer H3.
- Move the "jog" in H2 to the south and along roads to avoid homes.
- Reroute H2 to state land and run along section lines.
- Avoid the Wine Glass home site, the Fox Ranch, the McCoy Ranch, home sites, center pivot irrigation sprinklers, a gas well, subdivided land, and a cemetery near H2.
- Avoid conservation easement, cultivated land, and center pivot irrigation sprinklers near H3.
- Prefer H5 or the eastern alternative.
- Avoid Sunnyville Heights, a gas line, and grassland near H4.

3.8.2.9 Boone Substation to Midway Substation

The following comments on the segments between the Boone substation and the Midway substation were received between August 2 and December 31, 2006.

- Lines across BLM lands could affect ability to develop mineral resources and could affect other resources of concern.
- Avoid areas of sandy soils.
- Avoid or minimize new effects to state stewardship trust lands.
- Consider an alternative that runs south and west of the Pueblo Chemical Depot, rather than east and north.
- Avoid F1.
- Follow Xcel's proposed Comanche to Midway Line at north end of F2.

After the first set of scoping meetings, the segments between the Boone substation and the Midway substation were re-labeled from "F" to "I". The following comments on the segments between the Burlington substation and the Big Sandy substation were received between January 1 and March 16, 2007.

- Prefer I2, I4.
- Avoid I1.
- Avoid railroad corridors.
- Avoid the proposed LaFarge gravel pit.

3.8.2.10 Midway Substation to Big Sandy Substation

The following comments on the segments between the Midway substation and the Big Sandy substation were received between August 2 and December 31, 2006.

- Prefers N4 or any route Northwest of N3 (minimize effects to property).
- Consider alternative route that runs east of I-70 in Arapahoe and Elbert counties.
- Prefers N1 or N2.
- Avoid N4 (line would cut through landowner's property).
- Prefers N2 to N1.
- Avoid N1.
- Consolidate the new transmission line with existing Tri-State line.
- Stay on south side of existing line on N5 through Frontier Sportsman Club, or create new alternative that follows south and east boundary of club, away from existing line.

Following the first set of scoping meetings, the segments between the Midway substation and the Big Sandy substation were re-labeled from “N” to “J”. The following comments on the segments between the Midway substation and the Big Sandy substation were received between January and March 16, 2007.

- Avoid J2 and J3 because they encroach on the runway for the Limon Airport.
- Prefer J1, J3, and J5 because they avoid farmland and use pasture and range land, grassland, has lower construction cost, lower damage and loss of agricultural production risk, livestock can easily graze around the towers, do not affect visual resources, and are in sparsely settled areas.
- Avoid J4 because it crosses active farmland, center pivot irrigation sprinklers, steep hills and wet ground, it effects visual resources, homes, businesses, wetlands, causes electrical interference and has a high cost and damage risk.
- Re-route J4 to follow the Big Sandy to 125 mile 230kV line, then run it south to join J3 and J5 route.
- Re-route J4 to avoid homes, farms, ranches, a coal mine, and subdivided land. Re-route J4 to run SE and attach to I1 before going into the Midway substation. Re-route J4 one mile north of Hwy 94 using the existing 345 kV line ROW.
- J4 should be shifted west, or use the J3 alternative.
- Reroute J4 to avoid the Air Force Academy’s auxillary runway.
- Prefer J9 over J10.
- Prefer J10.
- Avoid wetland, barn, and windmill near J10.
- Reroute J4, J5, J6, J7 to run north of Yoder and east and south of Rush.
- Prefer J4 or J5.
- Avoid J3 because there is an existing transmission line.
- Avoid Sanborn road.
- Consider routing on state land or the Bohart Ranch south of Sanborn road.
- Prefer J3 to J4 because it is shorter.
- Avoid J5 because it is on highly populated and subdivided land with future home sites.
- J4 will minimize the number of homes and ranches affected.
- The Big Sandy to Midway line is impractical.
- Avoid residents north of Sanborn Road.
- Reroute J7 and J10 to avoid homes.
- Avoid homes near J1, J3, and J4.

- Reroute J10 to avoid homes.
- Avoid airport near J5.
- Reroute J5 to run along section lines and roads.
- Avoid the proposed LaFarge gravel pit.

3.8.2.11 Big Sandy Substation to Beaver Creek Substation

The following comments on the segments between the Big Sandy substation and the Beaver Creek substation were received between August 2 and December 31, 2006.

- Avoid J8 (very sandy and sensitive grassland).
- J9 runs over rough terrain.
- Prefer J12 and J6.
- Prefer J8 to follow Colorado Highway 71.
- Consider moving J3 one mile to the north or south (to avoid residences).
- Prefer J9.
- Move J1 to west of section line (adds to existing lines on property).
- Avoid J9 (sandy soils).
- Avoid western route (effects to shallow sand aquifer that supplies drinking water to Brush).
- Avoid J1 and J12.

Following the first set of scoping meetings, the segments between the Big Sandy substation and the Beaver Creek substation were re-labeled from “J” to “K”. The following comments on the segments between the Big Sandy substation and the Beaver Creek substation were received between January 1 and March 16, 2007.

- Prefer K11 to K9 and K10 because it affects less property, farmland, the F Cross Ranch, has the shortest distance, and it parallels an existing power line.
- Re-route K9 3 miles north where it makes a turn to reduce visual impacts, avoid a school, rough terrain, homes, farmsteads, and driveways.
- Prefer K10 because it minimizes impacts to Brush.
- K1 should stay on the west side of the existing line.
- K9 and K10 cut through a large amount of farmland.
- Prefer K9 to K11 west of Last Chance.
- Prefer K1, K10, and K5.
- Avoid K11 because it crosses multiple residents.

- Prefer the eastern route.
- Avoid homes near K2.
- Avoid Unocal 36" gas pipeline near K11.
- Avoid Sand Creek floodplain near K10.
- Reroute K5 to avoid dryland wheat fields.
- Avoid wildlife habitat.

3.8.2.12 Big Sandy Substation to Green Valley Substation

The following comments on the segments between the Big Sandy substation and the Green Valley substation were received between August 2 and December 31, 2006.

- Move K2 out of field and along highway.
- Prefer K13 route to the north.
- If K12 used, consider moving it south (between 112th Avenue and 104th Avenue to avoid residences).
- Prefers K2 to K3.
- Avoid K2.
- Prefers K3 to K2 (effects to farmland).
- Move K4 west to 144th Avenue (to avoid residences).

Following the first set of scoping meetings, the segments between the Big Sandy substation and the Green Valley substation were re-labeled from "K" to "L". The following comments on the segments between the Big Sandy substation and the Green Valley substation were received between January 1 and March 16, 2007.

- Avoid L1, L10, L11, L12, L14.
- Re-route east and north of the proposed route.
- Prefer L1, L8, L9, L15, L17.
- L1 and L2 should parallel existing line.
- Avoid L2, it cuts through farmland, wildlife habitat.
- Prefer L1 and L3 because it crosses less farm ground than L2.
- Prefer L3, L5, L8, L9 because it has fewer environmental and natural resources constraints and fewer homes than L4, L19, L12, L14.
- Avoid the area 10 miles east of Byers as it is platted for residential development.
- Re-route L1 to branch northwest 1 mile south of the Lincoln- Washington County Line.
- Avoid L12 as it cuts across Evergreen Country Estates.

- Do not split irrigation circles under L9.
- L22 should be moved farther east to avoid homes.
- L13, L21, L23 are in an area of high development potential.
- Prefer L23 because it is shorter than alternatives, more direct and will require less construction.
- Prefer L2 because it avoids rough topography.
- Reroute L15 and L9 to avoid center pivot irrigation sprinklers, a home, a windmill, wildlife pond, and hunting club.
- Reroute L5 to avoid sandy soils.
- Reroute L9, L15, and L8 to run along range and section lines.
- Reroute L10 and L11 to avoid a registered historic buildings and historic ranch.
- Avoid grain bins near L1.
- Reroute L15 and L17 to run on the west side of Road 246.

3.8.2.13 Green Valley Substation to Beaver Creek-Erie Tap

The following comments on the segments between the Green Valley substation and the Beaver Creek-Erie Tap were received between August 2 and December 31, 2006.

- Lots of development in area.
- Already affected by Xcel lines.

Following the first set of scoping meetings, the segments between the Green Valley substation and the Beaver Creek-Erie Tap were re-labeled from “L” to “M”. The following comments on the segments between the Green Valley substation and the Beaver Creek-Erie Tap were received between January 1 and March 16, 2007.

- Avoid M3 because it causes visual impacts on properties to the east.
- Stay to the east of Highway 71.
- Prefer M3 or M5.
- Prefer M4.
- Avoid M4 and the switching station on private land because it cuts through active farmland.
- M3 is shorter and more direct than M4.
- Re-route M5 to the east away from homes.
- Prefer M3 to avoid active farmland near M4.
- Reroute M4 to avoid cropland.

3.8.2.14 Big Sandy Substation to 125-mile Substation

The following comments on the segments between the Big Sandy substation and the 125-mile substation were received between August 2 and December 31, 2006.

- M1, M2, M3, and M4 is grassland (request line stay 0.5 mile from homes along these routes).
- Avoid M3.

Following the first set of scoping meetings, the segments between the Big Sandy substation and the 125-mile substation were re-labeled from “M” to “N”. The following comments on the segments between the Big Sandy substation and the 125-mile substation were received between January 1 and March 16, 2007.

- Prefer N2 and N4.
- Prefer N4 because it crosses less farm ground and more grassland.
- Follow N2, N3, N4.
- Avoid N3 because of rough topography, flooding, and difficult access.
- Avoid windmill near N1.
- Avoid home site and center pivot irrigation sprinklers near N4 and N5.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK