TransWest Express Transmission Project DEIS - FEIS

Summary of TWE DEIS Comments Received and Agency Preferred Alternative Assessment
Project Characteristics

- **Length**: proposed route about 725 miles

- **Structure types**: guyed steel-lattice towers, self-supporting steel-lattice towers, and steel poles

- **Structure height**: 100 – 180 feet

- **Span between structures**: 900 – 1,500 feet

- **Right-of-way**: 250 feet wide

- **Access road**: up to 24 feet wide

Photo credit: Manitoba Hydro
Purpose of Presentation

• Review Agency Preferred Alternative (APA)

• Present WECC compliant project description for TWE FEIS

• Present TWE DEIS comment summary

• Review upcoming TWE project milestones
APA Criteria Presented in the DEIS

APA criteria and parameters (developed through ID team) are used as a guide:

- Use of designated utility corridors
- Land use plan conformance
- Resource impacts that may affect project siting
- Public health and safety concerns
- Resource impacts that are of concern and may require mitigation
- Minimize use of private lands
- Expense
Agency Preferred Alternative Project-Wide
Agency Preferred Alternative Project Region I
Agency Preferred Alternative Project Region II
Agency Preferred Alternative Project Region III

APA has been adjusted to minimize impacts to UTTR Military Training Area.
## Modified Information for FEIS – 250’ Separation Distance from Existing Overhead Utilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Alt I-A</th>
<th>Alt I-B</th>
<th>Alt I-C</th>
<th>Alt I-D</th>
<th>Alt II-A</th>
<th>Alt II-B</th>
<th>Alt II-C</th>
<th>Alt II-D</th>
<th>Alt II-E</th>
<th>Alt II-F</th>
<th>Alt III-A</th>
<th>Alt III-B</th>
<th>Alt III-C</th>
<th>Alt IV-A</th>
<th>Alt IV-B</th>
<th>Alt IV-C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alt I-A</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Corridor
- **Green** Colocated
- **Red** Not Colocated
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Corridor Refinement TWE DEIS to FEIS – 1500’ Narrowed to 250’ Separation in Colocated Areas

Figure 2 – DEIS Transmission Line Project Description – Co-location

Figure 4 – FEIS Transmission Line Project Description – Co-location

Figure 2 Notes:
A. Structure and Access road disturbance information, including improvements to existing roads provided as modeled data for analysis in the DEIS. The dashed structure and access road locations shown in dashed format are indicative of the modeled data provided.
B. Transmission Reference Line for the TWE Project used a 1,500’ separation from existing high voltage transmission lines. Modeled access road disturbance data based on assumption that a separate access road network would be required.

Figure 4 Notes:
A. This example shows how the revised co-location criteria allows the TWE Project to be sited 250’ from the existing transmission line and how the existing access road network can be utilized for the TWE Project.
B. The Transmission Line Corridor for this setting has been narrowed to 500’.
C. Structure and Access road disturbance information, including improvements to existing roads provided as indicative data.
Pink areas of corridor will be eliminated, FEIS to analyze only yellow areas for possible alignment variations at ROW/NTP stage.

More detailed LIDAR information enables line adjustment to reflect preliminary engineering.

Wider corridor width needed in greenfield areas, steeper terrain, and private lands to allow possible adjustments with survey data, negotiations.
Pink areas of corridor will be eliminated, FEIS to analyze only yellow areas for possible alignment variation at ROW/NTP stage.

More detailed LIDAR information, 250’ separation enables line adjustment to reflect preliminary engineering.

Narrow corridor width in colocated areas, but more area needed at private land crossings for negotiations.
TWE DEIS Public Comment Summary*

- 457 Total comment submittals (1,869)
  - 178 Substantive (1,497)
  - 181 Non-substantive
  - 94 Opinion Only (372)
  - 4 Form Letters (114)

- 5 Ungranted requests for comment period extension
  1 – Allow more time for concurrent review with BLM sage-grouse planning efforts
  1 – 90 day comment period too short to research and review project
  2 – Conflicts and unresolved issues (cited desert tortoise habitat and Sunrise ISA)
  1 – Anticipated designation of Cross Mountain Ranch Conservation Easement

- 5 Ungranted requests to supplement DEIS
  1 – Analysis of 250' ROW centerline, analysis of 1500' separation from other cumulative projects in common corridors
  2 – LWC inventory deficiency/review, no comment period extension
  2 – Analysis of 250' separation spacing

*Bracketed number represents coded comments within letter submittals.
Region I: Alternative Public Comments Summary*

- Alternative I-A (Applicant Proposed)
  61 support: County preference; fewer miles of disturbance and associated impacts
  2 oppose: More impacts to wildlife in Colorado

- Alternative I-B
  1 support: Increased colocation in Colorado
  5 oppose: More impacts to wildlife; potential conflicts with pipelines in Wyoming

- Alternative I-C
  3 support: Less impacts to visual and environmental resources
  22 oppose: More miles of disturbance and associated impacts including private property, visual conflicts, agriculture and grazing, socioeconomic, wetlands, and sage-grouse

- Alternative I-D (Agency Preferred Alternative)
  6 support: Less disturbance to state trust lands, sage-grouse, and the Cherokee Trail
  26 oppose: Lacks county support; less colocation; more miles of disturbance and associated impacts including visual, socioeconomic, public safety, wildlife, sage-grouse, soils, cultural, vegetation, land use, recreation, and historic properties

* Rationale is cited per public comment and perception
Region II: Alternative Public Comments Summary* 

• Alternative II-A (Applicant Proposed)  
27 support: County support; fewer miles of disturbance and associated impacts; more colocation in designated utility corridors; less impacts to visual, wilderness, special designations, and recreation; avoids conflicts with LDS Church fee lands, Magnum Gas Storage Project, and Utah Solar 1 Project  
18 oppose: More impacts to wildlife, private lands, agriculture, visual, public health and safety, socioeconomics, special designation areas, recreation; greenfield crossing of Green River; congestion in Nephi Canyon; impacts to Central Utah Project  

• Alternative II-B  
3 support: Less impacts to mining, wildlife, sage-grouse; less inhabited areas  
26 oppose: More disturbance acreage and access roads miles; less colocation and designated utility corridor; more impacts to wildlife, private lands, agriculture, visual, special designation areas; congestion in Nephi Canyon; impacts to Central Utah Project  

• Alternative II-C  
4 support: Less impacts to mining, visual, recreation, special designation areas; avoids Nephi Canyon congestion; less inhabited areas  
20 oppose: More disturbance acreage and access roads miles; less colocation and designated utility corridors; more impacts to wildlife, private property, socioeconomics, special designation areas, communities; impacts to Central Utah Project  

* Rationale is cited per public comment and perception
Region II: Alternative Public Comments Summary (cont’d) *

• Alternative II-D

  1 support: More designated utility corridor; less impacts to visual, wilderness
  18 oppose: More impacts to communities; more cost; less colocation and designated utility corridors; more impacts to federally listed plants, visual, private lands, agriculture, socioeconomics, special designation areas; greenfield crossing of Green River; congestion in Nephi Canyon; impacts to Central Utah Project

• Alternative II-E

  2 support: More designated utility corridor; less impacts to visual, wilderness; more industrial areas; flatter terrain
  15 oppose: Less colocation and designated utility corridors; more impacts to federally listed plants, wildlife, visual, recreation, private lands, agriculture, socioeconomics, special designation areas, public health and safety; greenfield crossing of Green River; congestion in Nephi Canyon; impacts to Central Utah Project, LDS Church fee lands; more mileage

• Alternative II-F (Agency Preferred Alternative)

  11 support: More designated utility corridor; less impacts to visual, wilderness, Old Spanish Trail, private lands, communities; avoids Central Utah Project; less inhabited areas
  40 oppose: Less colocation and designated utility corridors; extensive greenfield areas; more impacts to water, federally listed plants, wildlife, cultural, visual, recreation, private lands, agriculture, socioeconomics, special designation areas, public health and safety; greenfield crossing of Green River; congestion in Nephi Canyon; impacts to LDS Church fee lands, Utah Solar 1 Project, Magnum Gas Storage Project; more mileage

* Rationale is cited per public comment and perception
Region III: Alternative Public Comments Summary*

• **Alternative III-A (Applicant Proposed)**

  14 support: Colocated with existing infrastructure in designated utility corridors; less landscape fragmentation; shortest route; less impacts to water, forests, wildlife, fishes, private and public lands, grazing, visual

  21 oppose: More impacts to water, forests, wildlife, fishes, tribal lands, special designation areas, visual, recreation, socioeconomics, public health and safety, fire; impacts to Mountain Meadows Massacre Site, tribal lands, the Paiute Indian Reservation, Beaver Dam Slope critical habitat, Dixie National Forest

• **Alternative III-B (Agency Preferred Alternative)**

  19 support: Colocated with existing infrastructure; less construction and operation disturbance; more socioeconomic benefit; less impacts to water, forests, wildlife, cultural, recreation, socioeconomic, undisturbed areas; consistent with existing land management practices; avoids the Mountain Meadows Massacre Site, Old Spanish National Historic Trail, Central Utah Project, Magnum Gas Storage Project

  14 oppose: Less designated utility corridors; more impacts to water, wildlife, visual, recreation, private and tribal lands, grazing, undisturbed areas, wilderness; Impacts to Mud Springs Wash, desert tortoise critical habitat; conflict with Ely District Resource Management Plan

• **Alternative III-C**

  5 support: Less impacts to water, forests, wildlife; avoids Mountain Meadows Massacre Site

  7 oppose: Less designated utility corridors; more construction and operation disturbance; more impacts to undisturbed areas, water, forests, wildlife, land use, wilderness, desert tortoise habitat, water rights

* Rationale is cited per public comment and perception
Region IV: Alternative Public Comments Summary*

• Alternative IV-A (Agency Preferred and Applicant Proposed)

  8 support: More designated utility corridors; less landscape fragmentation; shortest segment; less impacts to water, fishes, private lands, wilderness areas; avoids Lake Mead National Recreation Area and Red Canyon Rock NCA

  6 oppose: Less designated utility corridors; more impacts to water, forests, wildlife, visual, recreation, private lands, wilderness; more impacts to the Las Vegas Wash area

• Alternative IV-B

  4 support: Less impacts to visual, recreation, residential areas, private land, socioeconomics

  1 oppose: Contrary to the intent of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, more impacts to the Sunrise Mountain ISA, River Mountains Loop Trail

• Alternative IV-C

  4 support: Less impacts to visual, residential areas

  1 oppose: Contrary to the intent to establish the Lake Mead National Recreation Area; more impacts to the Sunrise Mountain ISA; more impacts to the River Mountains Loop Trail

* Rationale is cited per public comment and perception
NGO Supported Segments (in yellow) as presented by:

- The Wilderness Society
- Audubon Rockies
- Conservation Colorado
- Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance
- Beyond Coal Campaign, Sierra Club
- Grand Canyon Wildlands Council
- Utah Environmental Congress
- Wyoming Outdoor Council
- Wild Utah Project
- Rocky Mountain Wild
- Center for Biological Diversity
- Natural Resources Defense Council
## TWE EIS Next Steps and Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirm APA for FEIS</td>
<td>November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare FEIS</td>
<td>Jan – April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public FEIS NOA in FR</td>
<td>May, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Day FEIS Availability Period/Plan Protest Period Ends</td>
<td>September, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish ROD NOA in FR</td>
<td>October, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion and Comments

Target Date for TWE Agency Preferred Alternative:
November 29, 2013