

Appendix H Scoping Meeting Materials

WELCOME

Scoping Meeting Open House

Welcome to the public open house for the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

Purpose

This open house is to provide an opportunity for the public to review the proposal and project information, ask questions, and offer input. The format is designed to encourage one-on-one communications about the project. With this format, there will not be a presentation.

The Council of Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations require scoping meetings to be conducted in support of the EIS process pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). Scoping is the process by which the BLM is soliciting input on the issues, impacts, and potential alternatives that will be addressed in the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project EIS, as well as the extent to which those issues and impacts will be analyzed.

Stations

Stations are set-up around the room to provide details about the project. Representatives from the project team are available to answer questions and listen to your comments.

Register Comments

Please submit your written comments either:

- Before you leave today
 - ✓ Using comment form, or
 - ✓ Speaking with attending court reporter
- Online at http://www.blm.gov/nm/st/en/prog/more/lands_realty.html, or
- By mail

Please submit written comments by July 13, 2009 *even if you have spoken to a project team representative*, as this will help us keep track of the input we receive.

Thank you for your interest in this project.

opportunity to request assistance under the Rural Water Program. No form is required to be filled out in order to submit a statement of interest. The statement of interest will include information regarding the eligibility of the project sponsor to participate in the program, whether the proposed project meets the program eligibility requirements, and the extent to which the proposed project meets the prioritization criteria.

(3) *Assistance to Conduct a Feasibility Study.* To request technical or financial assistance to conduct a feasibility study, the project sponsor must have already completed an appraisal investigation. Since a statement of interest will have already been submitted, project sponsors seeking to conduct a feasibility study may simply complete a full proposal without having to complete another statement of interest. No form is required to be filled out in order to submit a full proposal. The full proposal will be used by Reclamation to determine whether the project sponsor is eligible to participate in the program, whether the proposed project meets the program eligibility requirements, the extent to which the proposed project meets the prioritization criteria, and to evaluate the proposal in general to determine whether it is reasonable and can be successful. The content of a full proposal will be described in detail in the program announcement and will typically include a detailed scope of work for the proposed study.

Frequency: Once annually, in response to the program announcement.

Respondents: States, tribes, municipalities, water districts, and other entities created under State law with water management authority.

Estimated Annual Total Number of Potential Respondents: 185.

Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent: 1.0.

Estimated Total Number of Annual Responses: 56.0.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 2,100 hours.

Comments

We invite your comments on:

(a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of our functions, including whether the information will have practical use;

(b) The accuracy of our burden estimate for the proposed collection of information;

(c) Ways to enhance the quality, usefulness, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(d) Ways to minimize the burden of the information collection on

respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. A 60-day comment period soliciting comments on this collection of information was published in the **Federal Register** (73 FR 67778, Nov. 17, 2008) in an interim final rule. No public comments were received.

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

Roseann Gonzales,

Director, Policy and Program Services, Bureau of Reclamation.

[FR Doc. E9-12525 Filed 5-28-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-MN-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[NM-114438; AZA-35058; L51010000 ER0000 LVRWG09G0690]

Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and Possible Resource Management Plan Amendments for the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project in Arizona and New Mexico

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of Intent.

SUMMARY: The Bureau of Land Management (BLM), New Mexico State Office, announces its intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), and by this notice is announcing the beginning of the scoping process and soliciting input on identification of issues and proposed planning criteria in response to a right-of-way application filed by SunZia Transmission, LLC (SunZia).

DATES: Comments should be submitted no later than 45 days after publication of this Notice in the **Federal Register**. The BLM will announce public scoping meetings to identify relevant issues through local news media, newsletters, and the BLM Web site (see below) at least 15 days prior to each meeting. We

will provide additional opportunities for public participation upon publication of the Draft EIS, including a 90-day public comment period.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments or resource information by any of the following methods:

Web site: http://www.blm.gov/nm/st/en/prog/more/lands_realty.html.

E-Mail: NMSunZiaProject@blm.gov.

Mail: Bureau of Land Management, New Mexico State Office, SunZia Southwest Transmission Project, P.O. Box 27115, Santa Fe, NM 87502-0115.

Courier/Hand Delivery: Bureau of Land Management, SunZia Southwest Transmission Project, 1474 Rodeo Road, Santa Fe, NM 87505.

Documents pertinent to the right-of-way application may be examined at: Bureau of Land Management New Mexico State Office, Public Room, 1474 Rodeo Road, Santa Fe, NM 87505, Telephone (505) 438-7471.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION: For further information and/or to have your name added to the mailing list, contact Adrian Garcia, SunZia Southwest Transmission BLM Project Manager, at the New Mexico State Office, P.O. Box 27115, Santa Fe, NM 87502-0115, or by e-mail at NMSunZiaProject@blm.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: SunZia has submitted a right-of-way application to construct, operate, and maintain two new single-circuit overhead 500 kilovolt (kV) transmission lines originating at a new substation in either Socorro County or Lincoln County in the vicinity of Bingham or Ancho, New Mexico, and terminating at the Pinal Central Substation in Pinal County near Coolidge, Arizona. The overall transmission line route would be approximately 460 miles in length, a substantial part of this length on BLM lands, and two separate transmission lines would be located on BLM, State, and private lands.

SunZia's proposal is to transport electricity generated by power generation resources, including primarily renewable resources, to western power markets and load centers. The SunZia project would enable the development of renewable energy resources, including wind, solar, and geothermal generation, by creating access to the interState power grid in the Southwest and providing increased transfer capacity. The proposed project would also increase power reliability across the southwestern United States, allow communities in southern Arizona and southern New Mexico to economically access energy generated from renewable sources, provide power

to help meet growing demand in the western United States, and enhance domestic energy security.

The Southwest Area Transmission Group—a regional transmission planning organization—identified a need for the project. Its importance is demonstrated by the abundance of proposed projects that have submitted interconnection requests to transmission owners within the proposed project area, and the potential for renewable energy sites within the SunZia project area. Additional transmission would be required to support development of potential renewable energy projects in Arizona and New Mexico. In addition, the requirement of each State to meet Renewable Portfolio Standards (RPS) and national interests in energy, demonstrate the need for the proposed project.

The proposed transmission line route and alternatives developed through the NEPA process would cross BLM lands in Arizona and New Mexico, as well as State and private lands. To the extent feasible, the proposed route would use existing transmission line corridors and designated utility corridors located on Federal land. One of the 500 kV transmission lines would be constructed and operated as an alternating current (AC) facility. SunZia may construct and operate the other proposed transmission lines as either AC or direct current (DC). The SunZia transmission lines would interconnect with planned substations along the route. Equipment additions and modifications would be required at each of the interconnecting substations. Engineering studies would determine those requirements as part of the project. A right-of-way of up to 1,000 feet in width and a lease-term of 50 years would be required to construct, operate, and maintain the transmission lines, structures and appurtenances. If constructed, the project would be in operation year-round, transporting electrical power to major substation hubs in Arizona and New Mexico. The project would have a bi-directional transmission capacity of approximately 3,000 megawatts or greater of electrical power.

The proposed project would take approximately three years to construct and would likely be constructed in phased segments with an in-service date of 2013. Specific acreages of access roads and temporary work areas would be determined through the NEPA process and project design.

In Arizona, approximately 43 miles of the proposed route would cross public land administered by the Safford and Tucson BLM Field Offices. In New Mexico, approximately 128 miles of the

proposed route would cross public land administered by the BLM Las Cruces District Office and BLM Socorro Field Office. The proposed route would pass in the general vicinity of the following locations:

Arizona: Coolidge, San Manuel, Safford, Willcox, Bowie, and San Simon; and New Mexico: Lordsburg, Deming, Hatch, Derry, Arrey, Truth or Consequences, San Antonio, Bingham, Ancho, and Carrizozo.

The BLM is the lead Federal agency for the NEPA analysis process and preparation of the EIS. Cooperating agencies identified at this time could include: The Bureau of Reclamation, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the New Mexico State Land Office, and the Arizona State Land Department. Other State and local governments will be invited to participate in the process, and consultation will occur with local, State, and tribal governments.

The purpose of the public scoping process is to determine relevant issues that will influence the scope of the environmental analysis, including alternatives, and guide the process for developing the EIS. At present, the BLM has identified the following preliminary issues: The potential effects of the proposed action on wildlife habitat, plants, and animals including threatened, endangered, and sensitive species, visual resources, National Historic Trails and related viewsheds; Native American traditional cultural properties and sacred places; soils/water from surface disturbing activities; local and regional socioeconomic conditions; consistency with local government land use plans; and future reclamation/mitigation from transmission line construction or location. The BLM encourages the public to send comments concerning the project as proposed, other feasible alternative locations, possible mitigation measures, and any other information relevant to the proposed action.

Authorization of this proposal may require amendments to one or more RMPs. By this notice, the BLM is complying with requirements in 43 CFR 1610.2(c) to notify the public of potential RMP amendments, predicated on the findings of the EIS. If RMP amendments are necessary, the BLM will integrate the RMP process with the NEPA process for this project.

Your input is important and will be considered in the public scoping process. All comment submittals must include the commenter's name and street address. Comments including the names and addresses of the commenter will be available for public inspection at

the above offices during business hours (7:45 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.), Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays. Before including your address, phone number, e-mail address, or any other personal identifying information in your comment, be advised that your entire comment, including your personal identifying information, may be publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold from public review your personal identifying information, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

William Merhege,

Acting Deputy State Director, Lands and Resources.

[FR Doc. E9-12512 Filed 5-28-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-FB-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Notice of Intent To Prepare a Feasibility Study and Environmental Impact Statement for Everglades National Park (Park) To Evaluate Modifications to the Tamiami Trail

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given, in accordance with the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), that the NPS is preparing a Feasibility Study and EIS to “evaluate the feasibility of additional bridge length, beyond that to be constructed pursuant to the Modified Water Deliveries to Everglades National Park Project (16 U.S.C. 410r-S), including a continuous bridge, or additional bridges or some combination thereof, for the Tamiami Trail (United States Highway 41) to restore more natural water flow to Everglades National Park and Florida Bay and for the purpose of restoring habitat within the Park and the ecological connectivity between the Park and the Water Conservation Areas” (2009 Omnibus Appropriations Act). The NPS is the lead agency on this federal action; however, the NPS has requested the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE) be a cooperating agency on this effort, with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) providing technical assistance.

DATES: Written comments regarding the proposed project must be postmarked no later than 30 days from the publication of this Notice of Intent (NOI) in the **Federal Register**. As part of this process, public workshops will be held to solicit public input about the proposed project. The date, time, and location of the public workshops will be

SUMMARY OF MAJOR REVIEWS ON EMF & HEALTH EFFECTS

INTRODUCTION

Over the past 25-30 years there has been some public concern that exposure to Power Frequency Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF) may be a health concern, for example; linked to cancer and in more recent years, childhood leukemia. This concern stems from some epidemiological studies that have suggested an association between exposure to these fields and health effects. Several thousand research studies have been performed and published over the past 30 years on EMF and health effects, but the vast majority of this research does not support a health effects association.

EMF and health effects studies is a very large and complex body of research material to objectively assess, fortunately this work has already been performed and is available for review by the scientific community and the general public. Numerous major reviews of the total body of scientific research on EMF have been performed by independent advisory groups composed of scientists from a wide variety of disciplines with expertise in EMF. Criteria for EMF research to be considered in the review effort; studies should have completed a peer review process and be published in scientific and medical journals.

MAJOR U.S. REVIEWS

Two major reviews have been performed in the U.S. The first major review was performed and published by the National Academy of Science (NAS) in 1996, and the second was performed by the National Institute of Environmental Health Scientists (NIEHS) and published in 1999.

In 1991, the U.S. Congress requested the National Academy of Science review the EMF research literature, evaluate the studies and prepare a report on the state of the science. The NAS, under the direction of Dr. Charles F. Stevens, assembled a committee of 16 eminent scientists from a broad background including epidemiology, medicine, biology, physics, chemistry, etc. This committee reviewed more than 500 studies spanning a period of 17 years with a primary focus on residential exposure.

In 1996, the NAS published their findings titled: *“Possible Health Effects of Exposure to Residential Electric and Magnetic Fields”* [1]. From the publications Executive Summary: *“Based on a comprehensive evaluation of published studies relating to the effects of power-frequency electric and magnetic fields on cells, tissues, and organisms (including humans), the conclusion of the committee is that the current body of evidence does not show that exposure to these fields presents a human-health hazard. Specifically, no conclusive and consistent evidence shows that exposure to residential electric and magnetic fields produce cancer, adverse neurobehavioral effects, or reproductive and developmental effects.”*

The second major U.S. review was performed by the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS). In response to the U.S. Congress “1992 Energy Policy Act”, the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences was directed to undertake and manage a program of research and analysis aimed at providing scientific evidence to clarify the potential for health risks from exposure to ELF-EMF. The scope of this review was broader than the effort by the NAS. The NIEHS was asked to: 1) review the existing body research literature, including epidemiology; 2) perform additional laboratory research (NIEHS oversaw more than 100 cellular and animal studies); and 3) perform public outreach, a goal to communicate these results to the general public. This effort is known as the EMFRAPID Program with the Department of Energy (DOE) having overall administration of the program. A product of the public outreach program is the DOE Publication: “EMF Questions & Answers, June 2002”, this publication may be viewed at the following web site:

www.niehs.nih.gov/health/topics/agents/emf/.

The NIEHS assembled a Working Group of over 30 scientists to review the total body of scientific evidence. Under the direction of Dr. Kenneth Olden the task was performed and their findings published in the following 1999 NIEHS/DOE Report; *“NIEHS Report on Health Effects from Exposure to Power-Line Frequency Electric and Magnetic Fields”* [2].

The NIEHS conclusions from page ii of the Executive Summary state: “*The scientific evidence suggesting the ELF-EMF exposures pose any health risk is weak*”. Furthermore, on page iii the committee stated: “*In our opinion, this finding is insufficient to warrant aggressive regulatory action.*”

MAJOR INTERNATIONAL REVIEWS

In addition to the U.S., major reviews have been performed by numerous European, Scandinavian, Asian Countries and International agencies such as the World Health Organization (WHO), International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP), and the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC).

For example, the most current review was published by the National Radiological Protection Board (NRPB) in the United Kingdom. The NRPB advisory group on non-ionizing radiation periodically reviews new developments in EMF research and reports its findings. The NRPB published reports in 1993, 1999, 2001, and again in 2004. From the NRPB’s 2004 Report: “*It is concluded that currently the results of these studies on EMFs and health, taken individually or as collectively reviewed by expert groups, are insufficient either to make a conclusive judgment on causality or to quantify appropriate exposure restrictions.*”[3]

SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS

Key considerations in these findings are:

- Weakness of Epidemiological evidence and associations.
- Lack of consistent Epidemiological findings. In addition to studies suggesting a weak association, numerous studies have concluded “No Association” or “Less Risk”.
- Failure to identify a Dose-Response relationship.
- Epidemiology has limitations and cannot demonstrate a cause and effects relationship.
- No plausible biological mechanism identified.
- Lack of support from laboratory research.

What is the scientific criterion used to evaluate if an environmental agent poses a risk to human health? A scientist by the name of Bradford Hill proposed that the total body of scientific research needs to be considered.

Applying Bradford Hill’s criteria, to support an assessment that EMF may have adverse health effects; the total body of scientific evidence must be considered. To establish a cause and effect relationship, the total evidence from Epidemiology, Clinical Studies (Human Volunteers), Cellular Research, and Animal Studies needs to show that an effect occurs. EMF & Health Effects research does not meet this criterion because the only existing evidence comes from weak epidemiology studies and lacks support from laboratory research.

Based on an examination of the major reviews starting with the NAS 1996 publication to the more current United Kingdom’s NRPB 2004 report, the majority of the findings are consistent. Almost without exception, these major reviews have concluded that the current body of research evidence does not show that exposure to power-frequency electric and magnetic fields poses a human health risk, should be considered unsafe, or require exposure standards.

REFERENCES

1. National Research Council, Committee on the Possible Effects of Electromagnetic Fields on Biologic Systems, “*Possible Health Effects of Exposure to Residential Electric and Magnetic Fields*”, National Academy Press, 1997. www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=5155
2. National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS), “*Report on Health Effects from Exposure to Power-Line Frequency Electric and Magnetic Fields*”, National Institute of Health, 1999. www.niehs.nih.gov/health/topics/agents/emf/
3. National Radiological Protection Board (NRPB) publication, “*Advice on Limiting Exposure to Electromagnetic Fields (0-300 GHz)*”, Volume 15 No 2. [U.K., 2004]. www.hpa.org.uk/web/HPAwebFile/HPAwebC/1194947415497