

**From:** [Meredith Griffin](#)  
**To:** [Peggy Fry](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Comment Letter Re Sun Valley to Morgan Transmission Line Project  
**Date:** Monday, February 11, 2013 12:23:50 PM  
**Attachments:** [Cmt Ltr Re Sun Valley to Morgan Transmission Line.docx](#)

---

---

**From:** Meredith Griffin  
**Sent:** Monday, February 11, 2013 12:21 PM  
**To:** Meredith Griffin  
**Subject:** FW: Comment Letter Re Sun Valley to Morgan Transmission Line Project

---

**From:** [dgodfrey@blm.gov](mailto:dgodfrey@blm.gov) [<mailto:dgodfrey@blm.gov>] **On Behalf Of** SunValley\_Morgan, BLM\_AZ  
**Sent:** Monday, February 11, 2013 10:00 AM  
**To:** Joseph Incardine; Ellen Carr; Kathleen Depukat  
**Subject:** Fwd: Comment Letter Re Sun Valley to Morgan Transmission Line Project

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Fri, Feb 8, 2013 at 4:14 PM  
**Subject:** Comment Letter Re Sun Valley to Morgan Transmission Line Project  
**To:** [sunvalley-morgan@blm.gov](mailto:sunvalley-morgan@blm.gov), [jincardi@blm.gov](mailto:jincardi@blm.gov)

Dear Sir:

Please see attached my comment letter regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Draft Resource Management Plan Amendment (RMPA) for the proposed Sun Valley to Morgan 500/230-kilovolt (kV) Transmission Line Project.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Signed:

[REDACTED]

February 8, 2013

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Sun Valley to Morgan Transmission Project  
Attention: Joe Incardine, National Project Manager  
BLM Phoenix District Office  
Hassayampa Field Office  
21605 North 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Phoenix, Arizona 85027

Dear Sir:

I have reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Draft Resource Management Plan Amendment (RMPA) for the proposed Sun Valley to Morgan 500/230-kilovolt (kV) Transmission Line Project. I commend the BLM for the comprehensive effort that went into this document to determine the range of feasible alternatives and their associated impacts to BLM lands. However, based on my review, I do not support the APS Proposed Action and BLM's Preferred Action.

My comments and rationale are as follows:

1. The BLM Resource Management Plan (RMP) for this area was developed after years of very extensive public involvement and collaboration. The results of that collaboration are reflected in the RMP decisions. The area envisioned for the transmission line project north of Hwy 74 was not identified as a utility corridor. Rather, that area is part of the Castle Hot Springs Management Unit. This entire management unit was allocated to the Castle Hot Springs Special Recreation Management Area. This decision was not made lightly. It reflects the outstanding recreation and resource values within the management unit and particularly within the Hieroglyphic Mountains Recreation Management Zone. The desired future conditions for this management unit include an emphasis on preserving open space and scenic/visual qualities and maintaining an array of recreation settings for both motorized and non-motorized activities. This area also has other important resource values, including category 2 desert tortoise habitat and class II visual resources.

2. The area north of Hwy 74 has been developed and managed as a highly popular off-highway vehicle (OHV) destination. Considerable investment has been made to develop the Boulders Staging Area and network of trails in the Hieroglyphic Mountains, including investments from both BLM resources and State of Arizona OHV funds. It provides an important venue for both local and non-local visitors to ride in a designated OHV area that promotes safe and responsible riding. This area has proven to be a successful showcase of how the BLM and State of Arizona

partnership can offer a safe, responsible, and popular venue for OHV recreation. The growing number of user visits to this area is a tribute to the success of this partnership. It should be recognized too that this venue has offered a great opportunity for the Arizona OHV Ambassador Program to promote safe and responsible riding.

3. In my view, the BLM should not select the Proposed Action as its Preferred Action because that would disregard (if not denigrate) the decisions made in the RMP to manage this area for its scenic and recreational values. Placing a utility corridor north of Hwy 74 would change the character and integrity of the BLM lands it would traverse. Plus in my view, it would create unacceptable adverse impacts to the recreational uses and public enjoyment of these lands. It could possibly result in OHV users going to other, less appropriate riding areas with greater potential for user conflicts. Why jeopardize the recreational successes BLM has achieved in this area?

4. I believe the BLM should give serious consideration to selecting Alternative 2 or Alternative 3 as the agency's Preferred Action. That would sharply reduce the utility corridor's conflicts with the RMP decisions and the adverse impacts it poses to recreational uses and public enjoyment of BLM lands.

In summary, I believe BLM must very carefully weigh the consequences of amending a land use plan that was developed with extensive public support and input. Logically, the Preferred Action should minimize conflict with the original land use plan.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. Please keep me informed as future opportunities arise for public comment.

Sincerely,

//signed//

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature.