

## **Appendix E    Comments Summary Table**

---



**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
<b>CODE 010.00 Purpose and Need</b>		
907	Renewable energy sources available in the near future do not justify a 500kV line, let alone two running across NM and AZ to supply power to southern CA.	
925	It makes the most sense for a new power station to be built directly between Tucson and Phoenix, not ~500 miles away. Period.	
926	One of the big advantages of renewable energy is that it can be created cleanly – so it can be done close to home. Transmission projects that carry power over long distances, hopefully, will soon be obsolete along with large generating plants. I think this project is not what we want for a cleaner, more practical approach to energy generation.	
978	For every reason, it would be hard for me to be more opposed to something than I am to this. "A," it's not green. If you build a power plant in Eastern, New Mexico, to send power to Arizona, the middle of Arizona at that, it's automatically not green. The wind blows in Arizona, and the sun shines there. If they want to have a power plant, they can have one, but not over here where it is going to cross Bosque Del Apache, the flyway which is used by tens of thousands of migratory birds every year for about the last 60,000 years. The government spent a lot of money, and the rest of us spent a lot of volunteer time making sure that that's a good place for them. Obviously, we can't do without energy, but we can do without energy traveling 600 miles for no good reason.	
988	I don't understand why they're pushing so hard to transport the electricity 500 miles. Why aren't they generating it in Arizona? They have areas there that they could put their collection system in, and they wouldn't have to transmit it more than 30 or 40 miles. I don't understand.	
989	I am a candidate for a wind farm in Lincoln County. And I am 100 percent in favor of this SunZia wind project because I think that the United States needs to get off the foreign oil, and every little effort that we do is beneficial. I think that Lincoln County could use the jobs. I don't see anything derogatory to this project at all. I think it's a plus. I think if all the environmental work is done properly, I just can't see how it's not a benefit to the whole Lincoln County – and adjoining areas, really.	
1033	California has its own windpowered resources. Why should it be supplied by New Mexico? They also have lots of sun for solar power. If they are going green for the global warming trend then they will have to provide for themselves.	
1037	My strong vote goes for following I-10 and I-25 corridors as much as possible. I realize that cost has ruled out underground transmission lines. However, if the money allocated for this SunZia project were spent on electric-use conservation (such as superefficient refrigerators and air-conditioners as well as thermostats and other efforts noted in the accompanying REPUBLIC article) the need for this transmission line could be moved forward a number of years. This time would enable	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	research on superconductors to advance to an affordable option; and superconductors must run underground for efficiency. Los Alamos Labs is working on this; they lack funds.	
1045	The SunZia Transmission Line Project appears to be a necessary project and could be beneficial for many areas of Cochise County including the San Simon and the Bowie areas.	Cochise County (AZ) Supervisor
1050	I really find it hard to believe that the wind doesn't blow in California and Nevada where this power is destined to be sent. It is far past time that the large urban area users of such power (Los Angeles, Las Vegas) quit trying to burden the rest of us with their needs! Attached please find comment cards and letters of others opposed to this project.	Aravaipa Property Owners Association (APOA)
1076	I believe the power should stay where it is produced.	
1080	Our recommendations are: First, it be established with certainty that electricity generated from wind in New Mexico is the best way to meet the electricity needs of Phoenix and/or Los Angeles...	
1084	The beneficiaries of power from this project, such as Los Angeles, Las Vegas, and Phoenix, must ultimately bear the true cost of developing this infrastructure, and if unable to do so, must limit their growth and/or consumption of energy. A route for a project that mainly benefits urban growth centers must follow established corridors that connect these centers.	
1086	As a resident and land owner in Lincoln County, New Mexico, I am writing to express my support for the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project. This project will help stimulate the local economy, bring needed jobs and tax revenue. Lincoln County has been blessed with an abundance of renewable energy resources, including wind, solar, geothermal and biomass. Full development of these resources will create personal income from land sales, land leases, construction jobs, fulltime jobs, as well as government revenue from sales taxes, property taxes, and income taxes. Full development of the area's renewal resources is currently being hampered because there is a lack of high voltage transmission access. The SunZia project would provide needed transmission access.	
1087	This project will help New Mexico achieve the goal of developing the state's renewable resources. New Mexico has taken a number of steps to encourage the development of renewable resources such as implementation of a renewable mandate of 20% by 2020, and the creation of the Renewable Energy Transmission Authority. The state's leaders recognize the value of converting wind, solar and geothermal resources into electricity and how it helps diversify the state's economy and achieve energy independence. The final steps towards fully enabling this goal will be the creation of transmission capacity to deliver the electricity to market. Without access to transmission, many of these renewable resources will remain stranded.	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1121	<p>Benefits to Tucson, Southern Arizona and Tucson Electric Power Company</p> <p>If the Project is run through Tucson, Tucson Electric Power Company will acquire more power from it, which will help fill and stabilize Tucson's and southern Arizona's future power needs. Subscribing to more SunZia power will help TEP meet future state-mandated renewal-energy quotas for the area.</p> <p>Benefits to Tucson Electric Power</p> <p>Figure 1 is taken from a presentation by Ron Belval of Tucson Electric Power Company (Belval, 2009) to the Southwest Area Transmission Oversight Committee and shows the projected growth in southern Arizona's power needs over the next 20 years. These needs are expected to double from ~3000 MW to ~6000 MW, nearly the full capacity of the SunZia Project if SunZia were to construct two 500-kV AC lines.</p> <p>Although southern Arizona could easily consume all of the power provided by one of these 500-kV lines over the next two decades, we understand that it is necessary to route both 500-kV lines completely to the Pinal Central substation, the project's destination, to maintain the reliability and integrity of the transmission system. If one circuit were to fail, the second would be needed to maintain power delivery. While it might be tempting to some to terminate one of the lines in Tucson, this would result in an unacceptable risk to the reliability of the transmission system.</p>	
1156	<p>My current question: why does anyone feel that this project "has" to happen at all? Just because a powerful consortium of companies, or a single giant, wants to do offshore drilling, does it mean they eventually must be able to? Times change. I still favor the more expensive route, that is, more expensive to the SunZia group, of Winchester to Vail through Tucson via steel towers instead of lattice towers.</p> <p>Distributed solar, lining the rooftops of our homes within power-producing PV panel systems, like Germany and Switzerland are doing so well, is the only logical answer. Big business does not think logically or long-term, unfortunately, but rather looks for more ways to stay within the status quo. Such a shame.</p>	
1169	<p>While, the City strongly supports the development and use of renewable energy resources, we feel that this must be balanced with a respect for local environmental, social, and economic development values and goals.</p> <p>We support the overall goal of bring renewably-generated energy to areas currently served by carbon-intensive energy supplies, but the development of this project will be a success only if it respects and compliments our local goals for environmental preservation, quality of life, economic development, and sense of place.</p>	City of Tucson
1181	<p>Please accept and fully consider these scoping comments on the proposed SunZia transmission project on behalf of The Wilderness Society, Sonoran Institute, NRDC, the Rio Grande Chapter of the Sierra Club, Western Resource Advocates, New Mexico Wilderness Alliance, and Defenders of Wildlife. We appreciate your continued consideration</p>	The Wilderness Society, et. al.

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>of additional routes for SunZia and providing the opportunity to comment.</p> <p>Clearly, our nation’s growing addiction to fossil fuels, coupled with the unprecedented threats brought about by global warming, imperil the integrity of our wildlands as never before. To sustain both our wildlands and our human communities, the undersigned believe the nation must transition away from fossil fuels as quickly as possible. To do this, we must eliminate energy waste, moderate demand through energy efficiency, conservation, and demand-side management practices, and rapidly develop and deploy clean, renewable energy technologies, including at the utility-scale.</p> <p>New transmission lines will also be necessary in some cases to bring remote renewable energy resources to population centers. Renewable energy and associated transmission development is not appropriate everywhere on the public lands, however, and thorough review under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) is an essential part of determining which of the many proposed utility-scale projects should be permitted to go forward.</p> <p>We strongly believe that long-term, environmentally responsible success of the Bureau of Land Management’s renewable energy and transmission program depends on developing policy and guidelines that guide projects to the most appropriate locations, thus limiting environmental impacts and reducing obstacles to construction of the most appropriate projects. We are submitting these comments in the hope that SunZia can find a route that provides transmission access to renewable energy without unacceptable impacts to the wildlands, water and wildlife of our southwestern landscape.</p>	
1207	<p>I doubt that much is being done closer to or in the electricity market areas to conserve or to generate electricity locally or on their rooftops. When every rooftop between New Mexico and the Pacific Coast has solar collectors, then a massive water-guzzling solar array in New Mexico and its attendant invasive power lines could perhaps be considered. But just not in the San Pedro River Valley or Aravaipa watersheds.</p>	
1228	<p>Furthermore, our rural area has been very pro-active promoting use of renewable energy, water harvesting – practicing pro-active resource management and conservation. We are in an area where individuals have installed both wind generators and photovoltaic solar systems. There is a collective opinion that monies to promote use of renewable energy should not be spent moving energy from erratic sources hundreds of miles through massive transmission lines but should be spent promoting point-of-use generation and developing programs such as has been recently introduced into the Senate 10 Million Solar Roofs and 10 Million Gallons of Solar Water Heating Act of 2010 – a program to provide rebates for the purchase and installation of solar photovoltaic systems and solar water heating systems for residential and commercial properties! The knowledge and experience of individuals within our community readily recognize massive public cost would be needed to transform our power grid to accommodate variable energy resources.</p>	J-6/Mescal Community Development Organization

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>The unpredictability of variable energy resources is problematic. When a wind farm is built, some other power source of the same size must be built to provide power during calm hours. “Wind and solar can lower the amount of fossil fuels used for generation, but they don't lessen the need for spending money on always-available generation capacity, nor is there evidence that the public gets all the air emissions benefits that are expected. For new generators, savings based on having free fuel from the wind or sun are small.”</p>	
1243	<p>...Sunzia is greenwashing the project since it starts near a coal plant and ends near where another one is proposed. Coincidence? I don't think so. If Sunzia wants to do green energy so much why doesn't invest in smaller footprint projects where power won't be lost because of the distance the power has to travel.</p>	
1255	<p>NPCA supports the development of renewable energy sources and understands the abundant wealth of solar and wind potential in the Southwest. However, when a project has potential impact on a national park unit, in this case White Sands National Monument, careful evaluation is warranted.</p>	National Parks Conservation Association
1259	<p>This project has been touted as promoting "green energy," but we know there has been no energy source identified at all. In the end, these towers could be used to carry electricity from nuclear plants or coal-fired plants. If the transmission towers are to be built at all, they should never be routed in the San Pedro River valley. I worry further that huge projects such as this one will be seen by some as holding out the possibility that we Americans can continue the unsustainable way of life we see today which has resulted in so much irrevocable damage to earth, air, and water, and in terrible species extinctions and poor prospects for the futures of all of us.</p> <p>We must downsize our projects, our lifestyles. Electricity should be produced in Arizona for use in Arizona, not transported hundreds of miles from New Mexico from a source as yet undescribed-probably with intentions of going all the way to the more profitable markets in California. Any new energy production and transportation schemes should be balanced with conservation projects.</p>	
1265	<p>Furthermore, with events like the BP [oil spill] tragedy in the news, we as a society should be looking to generate power locally, and use less of it. There is no reason to disturb these beautiful and rare remote areas.</p>	
1271	<p>BLM should acknowledge the inefficiency and cost of long-distance transmission projects and advocate for rooftop and car-park solar installations at the point of energy consumption. The substations of this proposed project could also have small solar installations to supplement their energy supply.</p>	
1273	<p>SunZia wants to make the case that this line will serve the greater good of mankind because it will transport needed power to Arizona and California. So while Arizona and California reap the benefits of New Mexico's energy we will be left with the hideous invasive culmination of steel and concrete in our pristine landscape. At this same time</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	neighboring states pawn off the burden and embodiment of urban growth and unrelenting energy needs in the form of power lines to New Mexico.	
1298	With proper thought and planning, Sunzia Southwest can utilize high-voltage paths already in existence from Magdalena and Socorro, New Mexico through Springerville and Holbrook, Arizona, rather than creating havoc for property owners and businesses along the I-10 corridor. Any plan that calls for the use along transportation corridors (utilities/railroad and/or transportation right-of-way) between Benson and Tucson will cut through developed residential communities, displacing many local residents. This would have a negative financial impact on this area; and, the potential for delaying the entire project in court for many years.	
1299	<p>First of all, I have seen nothing indicating a need for this project. We don't need to generate more energy, but instead need to discourage the population boom heading to the arid southwest where we have no water. That should be a priority for our survival.</p> <p>It will come to this eventually: that if we want more "green" energy efficiency, we all need to start relying on individual placement of devices like solar for our households, and it's up to industry and some clever individuals to make this happen. That will go a long ways toward keeping what's left of our open lands, healthy habitat for wildlife, and natural heritage around for future generations.</p>	
1328	The MVAS fully supports the development of alternative energy sources such as wind, geothermal and solar for a more sustainable future. However, it must be done in an ecologically friendly manner, otherwise it defeats the purpose. More of the energy generation from these sources should be done at the point of use. For example, on the roof tops of buildings and covered parking lots both public and private thus reducing the need for as many long distance transmission lines. The SunZia transmission line and the windmills associated with it must not degrade the land (especially public land) or the wildlife that live on it.	Mesilla Valley Audubon Society
1338	The Audubon Society understands and supports developing some of the wind, solar, and geothermal resources as important steps to creating a sustainable energy economy and combating climate change. Audubon supports renewable energy development provided that it is sited, designed, constructed, and operated to responsibly minimize harmful impacts on the environment. In particular, we believe that siting of renewable power and transmission line development in New Mexico should contain appropriate stipulations regarding wildlife and avian resources inventory, mitigation, and monitoring, including the cumulative effects of expanded development in both space and time.	Audubon New Mexico
1361	It makes no sense to destroy a near pristine area of the Southwest in order to transport "dirty energy" to the west coast. Dirty energy because, as stated by SunZia people, renewable energy is not yet available coming out of New Mexico. Thus, it's business as usual. With the proposed plans for building transmission lines through the San Pedro River Valley, Sun Zia is taking advantage of utilizing cheap Public	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>Lands in order to make an enormous profit. This is not for the benefit of the public but for the pockets of wealthy investors. It would make more sense if energy were generated closer to where it will be utilized. How about every home and business be equipped with solar panels on their roof? This would generate the energy needed, it would save our environment; it would create jobs for Americans building solar panels and installing them; and our unique San Pedro River Valley would be saved from destruction for generations to come.</p>	
1386	<p>The very first thing that has to happen with respect to an energy-response to climate change is to use less of it on a per capita basis. How is that to happen? Right now the cheapest and most efficient way to reduce carbon dioxide in the air is through efficiency and conservation. A huge reduction in energy use is possible immediately at a relatively small cost. We are aware that governmental home energy efficiency efforts have been largely unsuccessful.</p> <p>We must use energy efficiency and conservation to reduce our per-capita use so that less total energy will be needed. The transmission lines we have should suffice. Do we think that the current dirty sources of energy should be replaced? Of course!! we do not see what would be needed in the way of new transmission lines to exchange dirty energy sources for clean ones except for some spur lines for the clean-energy sources to enter the system and we think that the federal government should look askance at any effort to promote a larger program.</p> <p>What about the clean energy sources ostensibly being promoted through the construction of the proposed SunZia transmission lines? We all like the idea of carbon-free power. However, it is also true that what is needed is more baseload power. Photovoltaic and wind don't qualify except in the mind of some wind proponents who would link geographically distant sources in an effort to even out the spurts in generation. Both individual and large-scale photovoltaic in Arizona makes sense because of our dependence on air-conditioning in the summer and should be used to phase out fossil-fuel sources if just on a seasonal basis.</p>	
1389	<p>States that have mandated a certain amount of electricity from renewable energy sources by a set date need to deal with it themselves. These governments had no concern for traditional energy sources and should not be messing with the free market system to deliver energy in the most cost effective manner. Wind energy is one of the least efficient because it is not available 100% of the time and must be supplemented with other traditional sources.</p>	
1396	<p>At the April meeting, there was discussion by proponents on the proposed substations required for the project and the need to reach stranded resources. A project representative clarified that investments have not been made and that there are no existing facilities on the ground or "stranded resources" at this time. The Southwest Area Transmission study (SWAT) was referred to as an impetus for this project. However, the document does not identify the need to tap wind resources from New Mexico to move through Arizona onto California. It states that California needs more renewable energy and power in general</p>	Pima County (AZ)

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>and identifies western Arizona and solar as a potential energy source. It was also stated that one motivation for this project was Tucson Electric Power Company's (TEP) renewable energy needs.</p> <p>The Bureau of Land Management completed a regional assessment of potential renewable energy resource locations and set aside significant acreage in western Arizona for solar energy development. This should be considered as part of a needs assessment for the overall SunZia project. If it is found that energy resources can be generated in Arizona closer to the SunZia delivery destination, then the need for developing transmission lines from New Mexico across Arizona should be re-examined and new alternatives developed for public review prior to going forward with the EIS process.</p> <p>Locally, Pima County has been cooperating with TEP on specific Tucson area projects that contribute to TEP's renewable energy targets and are on a much faster track toward completion than what is being proposed by SunZia. It makes programmatic sense from a financial and environmental impact standpoint to locate and develop an energy source closer to the target area, as opposed to locating and constructing 500 miles of transmission lines across two vast landscapes to reach an intended target area.</p> <p>Considering the above, the County does not feel the SunZia project will significantly advance local efforts in renewable energy or that enough evidence and information has been provided to justify need for the overall project.</p>	
<b>CODE 020.00 Engineering/Design</b>		
884	I do not believe the new proposals address the issues of a river crossing between Bosque del Apache and Belen. Any crossing must be underground to preserve the integrity of the daily flight paths of Sandhill Cranes and migratory routes for other birds.	
920	Besides the sensitivity regarding wildlife migration, there is the concern over the damage to the landscape (both visual as well as physical.) There are too many beautiful parks in the Avra Valley that would suffer from the construction of a 1000-ft corridor and all the huge, unsightly towers. Why not construct more substations using smaller lines, or using existing corridors?	
986	Basically, my comment would be to, wherever the transmission lines are located, that there be flexibility in the servicing to allow for smaller substations. That would allow for the input of other renewable resources along the way, instead of just transmitting from one set point across lines. Other resources become available, geothermal, you know, things like that. And my specific instance is wood biomasses utilization where that power source could also be incorporated into renewable energy transmission, that its built to allow the those inputs along the line corridor.	
1008	While we believe the best pathway for this entire 460 miles of 500kv transmission line, fair and suitable to the people and wildlife of New Mexico, is simply underground, we do recognize this as cost prohibitive.	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>However, portions of this transmission line must go underground: especially all or portions of the originally proposed "A30-40-80" lines from SunZia-East Substation continuing west to San Antonio along Route 380.</p> <p>After some research, we are fully aware of the financial commitment to an underground system. However, in urban and more congested environments as well as in national parks, underground transmission systems are well at work. Since the year 2000, in places such as Massachusetts, New York, California, and Puerto Rico, Burns and McDonnell, a prominent U.S. based electrical engineering consultant and construction firm, has successfully finished miles and miles of underground transmission lines to improve the lives of the respective area residents and lessen the impact on local environments. If 25 miles of transmission line can be buried in San Juan, Puerto Rico, then 50 miles across the northern borders of White Sands Missile Range and Bosque Del Apache is also very possible.</p>	
1022	<p>Thank you for eliminating the route through our subdivision of windmill ranches! This shows process works: you asked for concerns, we gave them (along w/others) and as long as feasible, you adjusted the route. Now, we'd ask you do not select D10, as that would be our front view across the mountains. We prefer E10 as it is the farthest away. Another concern is the actual substation location. If it can go anywhere within the lined circle, the circle overlaps the subdivision. We understand you are considering and abandoned natural gas site. That would be a good way to reclaim the area and avoid private lands.</p>	
1031	<p>I am against building these powerlines across AZ to supply power for California. If the power is being used in California, build the generating plants in California. Save the cost of constructing this power line. If this transmission line must be constructed, consider putting them underground or alongside existing power lines of this capacity. Do not destroy the views of a new area to construct this power line. There is much work to be done before wind and solar generating plants are feasible on a commercial scale. These so called "Green" energy plants still require back up conventional generating systems.</p>	
1038	<p>Permanent or temporary construction/service roads and staging areas, needed to support the proposed transmission line, could have a substantive negative impact on wildlife and habitat. The use of existing roads is preferable over creating new roads. All new roads and staging areas should be kept to a minimum, restored to original condition (e.g., regarded, revegetated) if not needed for future service, and secured (e.g., fenced, gates) to prevent unauthorized traffic.</p> <p>The removal or pruning of vegetation during construction and for maintenance purposes should be avoided or minimized. In most cases, pruning is preferable to removable.</p> <p>Some of the proposed routes may be acceptable if adequate mitigation is provided. Examples of mitigation might include tower construction via helicopter to avoid the construction on new roads, or compensation to acquire or protect wildlife habitat or hunting opportunities in another location.</p>	Arizona Game and Fish Department

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1049	<p>If the long-term is being considered, power lines do not need to be on poles: powerlines can go underground. According to a friend of mine who works for a power company, in just 12 years, the difference between the costs of putting power lines underground versus the costs of stringing wires up on poles is recouped because of lower maintenance costs. Putting in power lines on poles is short-term thinking, and does not take into account the costs to the communities that they run through.</p> <p>Advances in technology are going to make the powerlines obsolete. Every year, here and abroad, people get closer to creating technology that allows most energy needs to be met on site, even for private houses. Two examples that have already been shown to work are thorium nuclear reactors that produce negligible waste, and E-Boxes, energy plants already in use that convert just about any form of energy into electricity.</p>	
1067	<p>Additionally, any proposed river crossing must be underground across the entire floodplain to minimize threats to the avifauna that travel the Rio Grande corridor.</p>	
1073	<p>Renewable energy should be used at site it is generated sun and especially wind power is so erratic and undependable that is must be backed by fossil fuel generated power.</p>	
1076	<p>Also wind energy is currently unreliable sources of electricity to use in this type of situation. I work with power companies all over the U.S. and I know this first hand. This "green" option has the ability to be "switched" to fossil fuel energy once the line is completed.</p>	
1110	<p>...we support SunZia’s intention to prepare a detailed Construction Operations and Maintenance plan for inclusion in the draft environmental impact statement for this project.</p>	<p>Center for Desert Archaeology; National Trust for Historic Preservation</p>
1121	<p><b>II. Technology Recommendations</b></p> <p>Because of space limitations within Tucson, it is essential to use any technology that can reduce the right-of-way required and the visual impact of the project, i.e., the size of towers and line spacing. While SunZia may be uncomfortable with these technologies because of possible concerns over decreased reliability, these must be considered. They include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Tubular-steel pole structure instead of a traditional lattice tower structure, with the best color or pattern to blend with the environment;</li> <li>– Double-circuiting of lines (having a single set of towers hold both circuits);</li> <li>– Compact line technology.</li> </ul> <p>The most promising and aesthetic technology found is that for the 420-kV double-circuit compact transmission line manufactured and installed in Dubai by Pfisterer, as shown below. While this technology will need to be scaled up somewhat for 500-kV lines and will cost more than traditional structures, it is important to consider it as part of a Tucson route solution.</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p><b>UNDERGROUNDING OF TRANSMISSION LINES</b></p> <p><b>Introduction</b></p> <p>Undergrounding or burial of transmission lines has become a nearly universal public request when new projects are proposed, and most lines would be at least partly undergrounded if it were not for the greatly increased cost – up to 10 times or more per mile – and technical complexity of doing so. Although U.S. utilities have extensively undergrounded power lines with voltages less than 230 kV and seem comfortable with this, undergrounding lines that have voltages of 230kV and higher (EHV lines) is still unusual. As voltage increases, the expense of undergrounding lines increases geometrically, and the added technical complexity makes utilities and transmission companies uneasy. Thus as voltage increases, transmission lines become ever more challenging economically and physically to underground.</p> <p>Even so, when new right-of-way is difficult or impossible to acquire, social objections are extreme, and the project is truly needed, burying extra-high-voltage AC lines up to 500 kV for short to medium distances is feasible and is sometimes the only solution. For long-distance undergrounding, DC lines must be used because the charging current in AC lines increasingly consumes transmission capacity with distance, limiting their usable length (Rosenquist, 2009). Undergrounding of EHV lines is more extensively done in Europe and Asia.</p> <p>There are four basic types of underground cables that are current used, and the following briefly describes these. These are summarized in many publications, including the Wilderness Society’s initial report on the SunZia Project (The Wilderness Society, 2009), but a summary is included here for easy reference. Each has its advantages and disadvantages, especially with regard to undergrounding techniques. Superconducting technology exists as well but is not discussed here because it is not sufficiently developed to use (CCI, 2010b). Most of the following discussion is taken from PSC Wisconsin (2006).</p> <p><b>HPFF</b> – High-pressure fluid filled. The three cables of a single AC circuit are placed in conduit, and then the conduit is filled with dielectric oil to both insulate the lines and dissipate heat. This type of installation can require pressure stations along the route, and pumps may need to be used to circulate the oil to dissipate heat. In the past, this type of installation has been the most commonly used in the U.S. and is the most trusted by U.S. utilities. Because all three cables can fit closely together in a single conduit, this greatly reduces the width of trench required for the cables. In the Boston NSTAR 345-kV example cited earlier, a single 8” conduit can contain all three cables for a line, and several circuits can be placed together in a 4-foot wide trench. One drawback with this cable type is that the conduit can leak oil into the environment if damaged.</p> <p><b>HPGF or GIL</b> – High-pressure gas-filled or gas insulated. This installation type is very similar to HPFF except that pressurized nitrogen insulates the cables rather than dielectric fluid. Nitrogen is less effective as an insulator and coolant than dielectric fluids (usually oil), however.</p> <p><b>SCFF</b> – Self-contained fluid filled. In this type of cable, the dielectric insulating oil is incorporated into the interior of the cable itself, and conduit is not needed. All three cables are independent and are run in</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>separate ducts or buried separately. As with HPFF cable, if damaged, the insulating oil can contaminate the environment. The lines are insulated with kraft paper and are protected by an aluminum sheath and plastic jacket. A variation of this is the PPLP, or polypropylene laminated-paper cable. In this case, the insulating jacket is a sheet of polypropylene placed between sheets of kraft paper. This cable type was used for Singapore’s 400-kV underground transmission system.</p> <p><b>XLPE</b> – Crosslinked polyethylene. Often referred to as “solid dielectric,” this cable type is fast becoming the standard for underground transmission lines, replacing HPFF and SCFF. It contains no fluid or gas for insulation, making it easier to use and maintain. Should it fail, it thus has less environmental repercussions than HPFF and SCFF cable. Preventing contamination of the polyethylene insulation is critical to prevent electrical discharges and breakdown of the line from electrical stress. The insulation is also about twice the thickness of that for oil-insulated cables. A circuit using XLPE cable has three cables, one for each phase, which are buried separately or inserted into individual ducts.</p>	
1181	<p>Recommendation that SunZia follow-through with their intended plan to include a detailed Construction, Operation and Maintenance [COM] Plan as part of the DEIS. We understand that SunZia plans to prepare a detailed Construction Operations and Maintenance (COM) plan and include it as part of the DEIS.</p> <p>Additional Information on Technologies that Could be Implemented to Minimize Impacts</p> <p>Transmission technology continues to improve, as do examples of successful implementation of new techniques to minimize impacts, some of which are detailed in Attachment A. These include but are not limited to undergrounding lines, advanced tower designs, using double circuits on compact monopoles and performing tower installation and maintenance with helicopters. Though these advanced approaches can increase technical and economic challenges for projects, they will only become more important to consider as transmission siting continues to grow more difficult and contentious. We note that CWG is submitting comments detailing additional examples of advanced technologies, and recommend BLM fully analyze opportunities to employ these technologies in the DEIS.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>BLM should analyze potential implementation of advanced technologies to minimize impacts in the DEIS, and where appropriate, require that they be used.</p>	The Wilderness Society, et. al.
1227	<p>If these towers are so powerful, what's to say they won't ignite those gas lines? These lines are a quarter mile apart and run parallel to each other the length of our property. They are a continuous worry without the threat of electricity being involved. These gas lines are 30 inches in diameter, so there is a tremendous amount of pressure running through them at any given time. Transwestern has only one pipeline, but El Paso has two 30 inch pipelines approximately 10 feet apart. What affect would the power lines have on the people that have to come out and occasional repair those lines? When they have worked on them before,</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	they have torches, grinders, welders etc. Basically lots of fire igniters. Couldn't the static electricity, or the electricity from the towers itself (around these gas lines) potentially cause fires?	
1238	We have been developing a long distance underground transmission option; see the attached article from Electricity Today. I do not claim that the SunZia project is an ideal "starter" project for our elpipe technology, but you should at least be aware of it. The SunZia project is envisioned as an AC transmission line, though arguably it makes sense as a DC project. It can only be sited underground if it is DC, though short segments through regions of scenic beauty/intense opposition can be undergrounded for an AC line. I'm open to discussing the undergrounding options.	Electric Pipeline Corporation (a spin-out of Rethink Technologies, Inc.)
1255	Line burial should be considered as mitigation to visual impacts or if this proves to be economically unviable, the transmission line and corridor should be removed from consideration.	National Parks Conservation Association
1268	<p>Additional Information on Technologies that Could be Implemented to Minimize Impacts. Transmission technology continues to improve, as do examples of successful implementation of new techniques to minimize impacts. These include but are not limited to undergrounding lines, advanced tower designs, using double circuits on compact monopoles and performing tower installation and maintenance with helicopters. Though these advanced approaches can increase technical and economic challenges for projects, they will only become more important to consider as transmission siting continues to grow more difficult and contentious. We note that CWG [Cascabel Working Group] is submitting comments detailing additional examples of advanced technologies, and recommend BLM fully analyze opportunities to employ these technologies in the DEIS.</p> <p>Recommendation: BLM should analyze potential implementation of advanced technologies to minimize impacts in the DEIS, and where appropriate, require that they be used.</p>	Empire-Fagan Coalition
1319	Any route through the Sevilleta National Wildlife Refuge, the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge and the Rio Grande Corridor is absurd and completely abusive. Furthermore, it would be eco-smart to color the lines in some fashion that birds may see, even at night. As for the disruption to the ground regarding pole installation, non-contaminating products and minimal soil disruption should be observed.	
1328	The Rio Grande is the major north/south bird migration corridor in the western United States. Powerlines are notorious for killing and injuring birds, therefore the placement of this powerline is extremely important. Current science seems to indicate that the best location for the powerline is to run around the east side of White Sands Missile Range. It is also suggests that all infrastructure be placed as far back from the river as possible. Since there is no "good" place for the powerline to cross the river, at the river and adjacent riparian habitat and all other sensitive habitat areas it should be placed underground.	Mesilla Valley Audubon Society

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1333	<p>Wherever transmission lines do cross the Rio Grande, markers should be used so the birds can avoid collision with the lines easily. There needs to be a program in place for continued monitoring of these lines and replacement of the markers on a regular basis. In fact a review of the impact of this powerline should take place every 3 to 5 years at a minimum to make sure nothing detrimental and unexpected is occurring to wildlife with the goal of correcting any unexpected or unintended detrimental effects. Where there are sensitive wetland areas the transmission lines should be put underground. As we see climate change many renewable energy sources and conservation can help wildlife if site and constructed properly so they don't harm birds and other wildlife (bats and birds in the case of wind power).</p>	
1338	<p>The Audubon Society understands and supports developing some of the wind, solar, and geothermal resources as important steps to creating a sustainable energy economy and combating climate change. Audubon supports renewable energy development provided that it is sited, designed, constructed, and operated to responsibly minimize harmful impacts on the environment.</p> <p>Because most areas occupied by cranes are known, the best alternative for the siting of the SunZia line would be to avoid locating this transmission line and associated structures in known crane concentration areas or to bury powerlines. Banded cranes have been known to live for 37 years. Cranes return to the same areas year after year, so adverse impacts will have long-term effects. To the extent possible, avoid locating transmission lines near major migration or wintering areas. If this transmission line is located in a wintering area for cranes, avoid placing this infrastructure in areas between potential roosting and foraging areas. Additionally, avoid use of guy wires for powerline tower support.</p> <p>Minimize Impacts in Crossing Rio Grande. Any crossing of the Rio Grande will entail significant impacts to migrating bird populations and other wildlife. The following recommendations may reduce impacts to cranes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Set transmission lines and associated infrastructure back from the edges of wetlands and croplands to allow for takeoff and landing by these large birds so that they do not have to pass through lines or facilities.</li> <li>2) Mark transmission lines with bird flight diverters or other markers so that they can be more easily seen and avoided by cranes. Powerlines marked with markers such as the yellow spiral vibration dampeners or yellow fiberglass swinging plates have been shown to reduce crane mortality by 54% to 63% in different studies. (Brown and Drewien 1995)</li> <li>3) Bury powerlines and transmission lines in areas where there is high crane use for roosting and foraging and likely potential for collision with takeoff and landings.</li> <li>4) Where feasible, turbines should be shut down during periods when birds are highly concentrated at those sites.</li> <li>5) Minimize roads, fences, and other infrastructure.</li> </ol>	Audubon New Mexico

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	BLM should consider the option of requiring construction of underground transmission lines where proposed rights-of-way conflict with sensitive biological resources, and where conflicts with military activities may reduce the feasibility of environmentally preferable routes.	
1343	If at all possible we recommend burying the lines underground in areas that crane’s and other migratory birds roost and forage because of the potential for collision with takeoff and landings. BLM should require construction of underground transmission lines where proposed rights-of-way conflict with sensitive biological resources and military activities.	New Mexico Wildlife Federation
1347	It is also clear that SunZia did not coordinate adequately with Tucson Electric Power (TEP) regarding alignments in the Tucson area. TEP’s ten-year plans suggest that there are significant opportunities for coordination between SunZia and TEP that would achieve major goals for both entities, and Cascabel Working Group discussions with Ed Beck, Line Siting Supervisor for TEP confirm this.	
1353	As a more environmentally conscious alternative, we support either of the proposed Tucson routes or other Tucson routes, which could be developed, were SunZia to share infrastructure corridors with Tucson Electric Power (TEP). We especially encourage you to adopt the Tucson route developed by the Cascabel Working Group. These alternatives would have the added benefit of meeting the requirements of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) for providing greater local access to this renewable energy rather than merely funneling it to markets outside the areas most impacted by the transmission lines.	Aravaipa Property Owners Association
1354	While I appreciate the conservation value of renewable energy, delivering it at the expense of a fragile environment [Aravaipa and San Pedro] is irresponsible. There are routes through Tucson using existing infrastructure corridors which would have far less impact on the environment. If this project is to go forward, the obvious solution is for SunZia to work with local Arizona power companies and route the transmission lines accordingly, with as little disruption to the environment as possible.	
1374	We also have concerns about other possible crossing locations because of the likelihood with fatal collisions by Sandhill Cranes and other migratory birds. However we recognize that the line must cross at some point. Where the SunZia line crosses the Rio Grande, mitigation measures must be put in place that include avoidance of critical wetlands, marking of the transmission line with flight diverters or powerline markers, as well as burying the line underground where it crosses sensitive riparian areas where roosting and foraging create a high potential for collisions. BLM should require construction of underground transmission lines where proposed rights-of-way conflict with sensitive biological resources.	Sangre de Cristo Audubon Society
1381	We are submitting these comments on the proposed SunZia Transmission Project on behalf of the Sierra Club’s Grand Canyon (Arizona) Chapter, Defenders of Wildlife, the Center for Biological	Sierra Club, et. al.

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>Diversity, the Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection, Arizona Wilderness Coalition, Tucson Audubon Society, and the Center for Desert Archaeology.</p> <p>Construction Impacts</p> <p>Every attempt should be made to avoid sensitive lands, important wildlife habitat, special status plants, and archaeological sites during construction. Many significant impacts from electric transmission lines occur during construction. Each of the towers requires grading, vegetation removal, and placement of a large concrete footing for the tower itself. During construction, impacts include the following: soil disturbance and eradication of plant communities; disturbance of ground-dwelling species including amphibians, mammals, and groundnesting birds; soil erosion; interference with large mammals such as pronghorn, elk, and deer that prefer locations distant from roads; and interference with birds and bats, whether migrating or not.</p>	
1395	<p>The Nature Conservancy would also like to emphasize that our “Development by Design” strategies of: (1) avoid, (2) minimize, and (3) mitigate may be helpful in the siting process of the SunZia Transmission Project.</p>	The Nature Conservancy
1398	<p>We are very concerned with any discussion of power transmission lines paralleling natural gas pipelines through our ranch. We have two 36” natural gas pipeline easements (with two different companies) that run through our ranch. We have had the horrifying experience of suffering thousands of dollars of damage to the plumbing in our buildings when electric current from the cathodic protection system on one of the 36” natural gas pipelines was drawn /attracted through the earth to the power lines adjacent to our buildings that are located almost a mile from the gas pipe lines. As this electricity passed through the ground seeking the power lines, it ate holes in our copper pipes, compromising the plumbing in every one of our recently constructed buildings (they were about a year old). We had to suspend our guest ranch business while we spent thousands of dollars in repairs to each of our buildings. We have several easements through our ranch already. Each one of them brings its own set of issues that we must deal with.</p>	
<b>CODE 030.00 Corridor Alignment/Alternatives</b>		
886	<p>We are very much in favor of the line through Bingham but if need be go through the Sevilleta and the Bosque del Apache.</p>	
904	<p>Prefer route east side of White Sands via Carrizozo.</p>	
905	<p>Absolutely opposed to A30, A40, A80, A111, A130. This is not acceptable. East of Rio Grande and south of refuge acceptable.</p>	
907	<p>The southern route parallel to I-10 is the only route that is feasible to concerned public. Consideration to crossing should be to the Tohono O’odham lands and even going only across or west of the Ironwood monument.</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
917	Should not be C830, C620, C690, C301, C273, C470, C450 – environmentally sensitive archeological sites, wildlife, beauty, people, children, home, etc. I-10 corridor is better.	
937	This powerline should completely avoid all the routes north of the Catalina Mountains. Those routes would adversely impact the ecological and cultural resources in that area. Not only would it cause environmental damage associated with the San Pedro Valley, but those routes would fragment a large block of State Trust and private lands and therefore harm the ranches in that area.	
953	As owners of property at Windmill Ranch, we would like to express our preference for Alternate Route E10 and E80 for the SunZia proposed transmission lines. We strongly object to route D10 and A30.	
987	I'm from Corona, New Mexico, and I just want to register my support for the Sun Zia project. And I strongly encourage the BLM to approve the route A90, which is – would be the most cost-effective route to make this project happen.	
1005	<p>The Socorro Soil and Water Conservation District (SSWCD) wishes to voice its concern regarding the proposed routes of the SunZia Transmission line.</p> <p>Our district, in cooperation with the USFWS, has dedicated numerous resources to help restore the Sevilleta to its natural pristine state. We suggest a route that exercises better judgment in providing reasonable routes for the SunZia Transmission Line. The proposed routes closest to the Rio Grande will have the greatest impact on the migratory bird flyway and will have the strongest negative impact to local economy. We feel that the preferable choice of the proposed route should run on the east side of the Rio Grande and of the White Sands Missile Range, along the alternative transmission line route that runs south until Interstate 10, avoiding densely populated areas.</p>	Socorro Soil and Water Conservation District
1008	As permanent residents and ranchers of New Mexico in the Scholle and Chupadera areas (approximately 5-25 miles south of Rt. 60 and 10-25 miles west of Mountainair) we are absolutely opposed to the “Study Area Expansion April 2010.” Referencing your maps dated April 23,2010, from the proposed SunZia-East Substation to the San Antonio area turning-point-south, we request that both northerly proposed routes known as "E10" and "E80" (in the expansion study) and route "A50-60-90" (in the original study) be removed from further consideration.	
1032	The proposed line to the East of the White Sands Missile Range is the only choice that provides for minimizing the massive negative impact of the project on the critical flyways of the Bosque del Apache Wildlife Refuge. The eastern most route is the only option that addresses these environmental issues with an acceptable solution. I strongly urge that this route be adopted to avoid the potential damages to the valley both environmentally and economically.	NM Representative Don Tripp
1034	No route for the Project should be considered except routes already ecologically damaged by extant energy transmission equipment, such as in the I-10 corridor.	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1038	<p>The proposed route (F10) beginning near Wilcox, then heading south around the playa to Benson, could be detrimental to migratory sandhill cranes and waterfowl.</p> <p>Evaluate the feasibility of a new route following I-10 from northeast of Wilcox to Benson. In the proximity of the intersection of highway 191 with I-10, consider the feasibility of a route around the north end of the Little Dragoon Mountains.</p>	Arizona Game and Fish Department
1070	<p>[As a member] of the Friends of the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge, and as a citizen who lives in the flyway, I would like to convey our opposition to the proposed study area expansion, as it does not provide any new routes that would relieve our concerns regarding the wildlife and economy of our community. Routes with valley crossings between Socorro and Belen would still pose a hazard to the daily flight patterns of sandhill cranes and snow geese, as well as the migratory pathway for hundreds of thousands of other birds.</p>	
1088	<p>As a resident and land owner in Lincoln County, New Mexico, I am writing to express my support for the location of the proposed substation in our County, along with developed alternative routes that connect to this substation.</p> <p>I am opposed to the expanded study area north of Socorro because this would unnecessarily increase the impact on the environment through additional miles of transmission lines.</p>	
1148	<p>I am writing to voice my objection to one of the possible power line routes for the SunZia Transmission Project, specifically, the one within the corridor that passes through San Acacia, Polvadera and or Lemitar in Socorro County.</p>	
1166	<p>Concerning the proposed route for SunZia’s powerline across the northern ends of Socorro and Polvadera, I strongly urge you to reconsider the corridor proposed in SunZia’s original 2008 filing, which follows White Sand’s western fence line. I agree with the Fish and Wildlife Service that this western boundary route is the most reasonable in that it protects wildlife along the Rio Grande flyway and has the least impact on our communities.</p>	
1168	<p>I am writing to express my grave concerns regarding one of the proposed routes for the SunZia Southwest Transmission project, specifically the route labeled E10, one of the “alternative routes subject to feasibility study” in the New Mexico Study Area Expansion of April 2010. I am one of eleven households that are located in the vicinity of alternative route E10. We all live along County Road A-125, which runs south of U.S. Highway 60 at mile marker 191. Your route E10 crosses A-125 approximately three miles south of Highway 60.</p>	
1268	<p>Alternative Routes Outside of Pima County. We recommend that BLM look at reasonable opportunities, routes and corridors north and east of Pima County. Such routes would take advantage of shorter stretches from Sunzia East along Interstate 60 west of Socorro or Interstate 40 north of I-60. This would allow an invitation to the Navajo and/or Apache Nations for possible positive economic opportunities associated</p>	Empire-Fagan Coalition

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	with the Sunzia project. Has any organization solicited comments from either Nation in regard to this project? These potential routes are reasonable, potential shorter (from Sunzia East to Pinal Central), and could have a higher level of buildability along existing transportation corridors closer to other existing 500kv systems. As such they deserve further consideration.	
1276	I write to register my deep concern about the possibility of transmission lines from the Sun Zia Project being run through Aravaipa Canyon in Arizona. This is an extremely rare and fragile ecology.	
1307	I see that you have finally decided to study an alternative route that runs south of T or C [Truth or Consequences], N.M. This is probably the best of a bunch of poor options.	
1345	Since the beginning of the EIS more than one year ago, the BLM has significantly changed the Study Area for the proposal, and into areas that affect additional park units under our jurisdiction and management. Eight NPS parks, consisting of eleven separate units are considered by NPS to have concerns of potential impacts ranging from major and significant to relatively insignificant in nature. NPS considers parks even as distant as twenty miles from the Study Area as those with possible concerns, and those impacts should be evaluated.	National Park Service
1350	I must speak out that any alignment other than the Tucson alignment, is err-responsible when considering the impact on un-developed areas of the state. We will be destroying huge areas of landscape that will never recover – all for the sake of California and their required energy numbers.	
1368	Based on our knowledge of the area, and our land and wildlife conservation work, we strongly recommend that you select the original (2008) “Proposed Route” across New Mexico as “Preferred Alternative” for the eastern (New Mexico) portion of the powerline. We have reviewed the route alternatives map and specifically recommend Route numbers A181 and A300 (or alternately, A250) as the Proposed Route for the SunZia DEIS:  The route cuts diagonally west-southwest from the new sub-station north of Carrizozo, past the northwest corner of White Sands Missile Range (WSMR) property just south of Highway 380, where it turns immediately south, following the WSMR boundary to the point where the line must head west in order to cross the Rio Grande just south of Arrey, NM.	Rio Grande Agricultural Land Trust
1401	Fort Bliss supports the inclusion and evaluation of the alternate routes in the Environmental Impact Statement being prepared by BLM. The proposed routes in Lincoln, Torraine, Valencia, and Socorro Counties could potentially minimize detrimental impacts to training and operations at Fort Bliss and other military installations in New Mexico.	Ft. Bliss
<b>CODE 031.00 Avoid/Concerns for Area</b>		
1381	<i>New Mexico Wilderness Alliance Citizen’s BLM Wilderness Inventory Units in the Quebradas</i>	Sierra Club et. al.

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	The E130, E110, and A90 would cut across the Sierra de la Cruz, Veranito, and Stallion New Mexico Wilderness Alliance Citizen’s Wilderness Inventory Units, respectively. In order to maintain the well documented wilderness characteristics and values of these and adjacent areas in the “Quebradas” wildlands complex east of Socorro, we recommend excluding these routes from further consideration.	
879	As an owner of parcel 130, Windmill Ranches, I submit the following: New Mexico development is crucial to the economy. Developers promote investments in properties such as Windmill Ranches and we in turn boost the overall economy. Please protect such projects for our individual properties and the New Mexico growth.	
884	I do not believe the new proposals address the issues of a river crossing between Bosque del Apache and Belen. Any crossing must be underground to preserve the integrity of the daily flight paths of sandhill cranes and migratory routes for other birds. Routes adjacent to Belen still mar the landscape/viewscape as they come past Socorro and San Antonio.	
889	I am encouraged that the routes will not dissect Windmill Ranches (326 lots), as previously proposed. Please consider route E10 or E80, not D10. E10 or E80 will make many land owners very happy.	
890	As a resident of Windmill Ranches, please consider the route of E10 or E80. I know that the other 325 lot owners would feel the same. Please do not consider D10 which is extremely close to a major residential area.	
944	We live in a subdivision about 4 miles from routes [C]620 and [C]690 and the power lines would be easily visible from our house (we live in Sect 1 TWS9S Range 12E – Pinal County.) Both routes also cross deeded land owned by Willow Springs Properties LLC (6400 acres.) Run the lines along Hwy 79 or I-10.	
953	As owners of property at Windmill Ranch, we would like to express our preference for Alternate Route E10 and E80 for the SunZia proposed transmission lines. We strongly object to route D10 and A30. Routes referenced are per latest maps of proposed routes dated April 22, 2010.	
961	We are writing concerning the project of yours that is proposed to go right thru the center of Windmill Ranch. When we bought our property 7 years ago we thought we were buying a place that was quiet, natural and would be conserved for all to enjoy. If your company puts a huge power line thru the property all of that beauty will be gone. We do not understand how a company would want to do that. We realize that at the moment the ranch just looks like pretty much vacant land but there are many property owners and your plan will change the entire ranch forever. Could you please not do this. Nobody would want to live by or under those lines and nobody wants to look at them everyday.	
1008	As permanent residents and ranchers of New Mexico in the Scholle and Chupadera areas (approximately 5-25 miles south of Rt. 60 and 10-25 miles west of Mountainair) we are absolutely opposed to the “Study Area Expansion April 2010.” Referencing your maps dated April	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	23,2010, from the proposed SunZia-East Substation to the San Antonio area turning-point-south, we request that both northerly proposed routes known as "E10" and "E80" (in the expansion study) and route "A50-60-90" (in the original study) be removed from further consideration.	
1009	I would not want these high voltage towers routed through our town of Mescal or J-6. These towers will make our neighborhood look like an industrial zone and will hurt residential property values. I suggest an alternate route along highway 40 or along remote railroad tracks, but not through AZ towns or cities. Since AZ residents will not benefit from this transfer of electricity, neither should residents have to suffer by having these ugly towers in our backyards.	
1010	1. follow Interstate 40, from northern New Mexico through Arizona to California. 2. follow the railroad tracks from New Mexico to California. If the transmission lines follow the I-10 corridor they will go through the small residential area of Mescal [Benson, AZ]. The towers are unsightly enough especially when they're so close to home. As a resident of the Mescal area [Mescal Lakes Subdivision], we receive no benefits from the electric power generated in New Mexico and sold to California.	
1015	My wife and I purchased property in Deer Canyon near Mountain, NM. This project appears to invade that area. We never would have purchased if this project was known. It will substantially decrease our property value. The project appears to be close proximity to Abo and Grana Quivira part of Salinas, NM. The appearance will be a further scar of modern society and a sign of disrespect for our American heritage. I respectfully request that the expansion area avoid these areas.	
1021	I greatly disapprove of your choice of location for these transmission lines through Southern Arizona going to California. I live in the community of Mescal just north of I-10 and West of Benson Arizona. One reason I chose to live here was this area has all utility lines buried underground. The views of the mountains are very enjoyable. Upon study of the maps it appears a more direct route for these lines would be northern Arizona possibly following I-40 route or valley areas north of Heber and west through less populated areas.	
1076	I believe the power should stay where it is produced. If it must go through AZ, go Northern AZ where fewer people live. Cochise County has more privately owned land than any other AZ county. Do not put the lines through populated areas. Also wind energy is currently unreliable sources of electricity to use in this type of situation. I work with power companies all over the U.S. and I know this first hand. This "green" option has the ability to be "switched" to fossil fuel energy once the line is completed. We do not want our wonderful rural views turned into a steel tower city. Using I-10 corridor is just wrong as it is highly populated. I moved here [Benson, AZ] for ruralness and views, don't take that away from us.	
1111	As a member of the Corona Landowners' Association and a resident in Lincoln County, New Mexico, I am writing to express my support for	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project. This project will help stimulate the local economy, bring needed jobs to a depressed area and contribute to the tax revenue thus aiding in the financing of education for the youth of Lincoln County. Lincoln County has been blessed with an abundance of renewable energy resources, including wind, solar, geothermal and biomass. Full development of these resources will create personal income from land sales/leases, construction jobs, full-time jobs, as well as government revenue from sales taxes, property taxes and income taxes. However, full development of the area's renewal resources is currently being hampered because there is a lack of high voltage transmission access. The SunZia project would provide needed transmission access.</p>	
1114	<p>As a resident and land owner in Lincoln County, New Mexico, I am writing to express my support for the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project. This project will help New Mexico achieve the goal of developing the state's renewable resources. New Mexico has taken a number of steps to encourage the development of renewable resources such as implementation of a renewable mandate of 20% by 2020, and the creation of the Renewable Energy Transmission Authority. The state's leaders recognize the value of converting wind, solar and geothermal resources into electricity and how it helps diversify the state's economy and achieve energy independence. The final steps towards fully enabling this goal will be the creation of transmission capacity to deliver the electricity to market. Without access to transmission, many of these renewable resources will remain stranded. The SunZia project should be granted all necessary permits to help New Mexico remain leader in clean energy.</p>	
1143	<p>As a member of the Corona Landowners' Association, a landowner in southern Tarrant County, and a resident of Lincoln County, New Mexico, I am writing to express my support for the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project. This project will help New Mexico achieve the goal of developing the state's renewable resources.</p> <p>New Mexico has taken a number of steps to encourage the development of renewable resources such as implementation of a renewable mandate of 20% by 2020, and the creation of the Renewable Energy Transmission Authority. The state's leaders recognize the value of converting wind, solar and geothermal resources into electricity and ways in which it helps diversify the state's economy and achieve energy independence.</p> <p>The final steps toward fully enabling this goal will be the creation of transmission capacity to deliver the electricity to market. Without access to transmission, many of these renewable resources will remain stranded.</p> <p>The SunZia project should be granted all necessary permits to help New Mexico remain a leader in clean energy production.</p>	
1146	<p>One of the possible routes you have proposed for the SunZia 500 KV power lines passes through San Acacia, Polvadera, and/or Lemitar in Socorro County. I strongly object to your using this corridor and ask that you use one of your alternate corridors instead. All things considered,</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>the corridor(s) along White Sands would seem to be far better alternatives.</p> <p>My objection is based on (1) scientific evidence indicating possible links between EMFs and childhood leukemia, fibromyalgia, Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's, migraine headaches, sleep disorders, allergies, and asthma; (2) degradation of local property values because of potential buyers' concerns about health, neighborhood aesthetics, quality of life and diminished resale value; (3) possible negative effects on the migratory, reproductive and nesting behavior of the tens (hundreds?) of thousands of birds which migrate here annually; and (4) associated negative effects on the bird centered tourist industry in the City of Socorro, the Bosque del Apache and surrounding communities.</p> <p>It is for these reasons that I object to your possibly placing power lines in my area.</p>	
1148	<p>I am writing to voice my objection to one of the possible power line routes for the SunZia Transmission Project, specifically, the one within the corridor that passes through San Acacia, Polvadera and or Lemitar in Socorro County.</p> <p>As a resident of Polvadera, I am concerned about various negative effects of these power lines and associated towers. One major concern is with effects on health. There is evidence which suggests that the EMFs associated with these lines may cause or contribute to a number of health problems, including cancer (particularly among children), migraine headaches, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, fibromyalgia, high blood pressure, asthma, chronic fatigue, insomnia and allergies. Another concern regards possible effects on birds' migratory behavior. This proposed route lies directly in the flight path of thousands of birds migrating to the Bosque del Apache and points further south. Disruption would affect not only the birds but also the tourist industry in this area (particularly in the City of Socorro and at the Bosque), due to the large number of "birders" who come here in the fall to observe the many species who winter here.</p> <p>I am also concerned about the obvious decimation of property values, owing to the fact that many people who might otherwise buy homes in this area would not do so if these high voltage lines were nearby, given concerns about health, aesthetics, quality of life and resale value.</p> <p>For these reasons, I strongly object to locating power lines in the above-mentioned corridor and ask that you choose some alternate route that does not have such negative effects on the human and animal populations. The corridors bordering White Sands would seem to be a much better alternative.</p>	
1199	<p>I own property outside of Carrizozo, New Mexico and am extremely interested in the proposed route of transmission lines. The northern routes would be the most favorable for me and my fellow property owners, those being E10 and E80. The least favorable route would be D10. Please consider what this transmission would do to property values. They would plummet.</p>	
1228	<p>The J-6 Mescal Community Development Organization appreciated the opportunity to review large wall maps which we shared with our</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>neighborhoods located along the I-10 corridor between and within the Buffalo Soldiers Electronic Testing Range and Pima County Conservation lands. Residents within our area mostly live in clustered population centers that cannot avoid impacts from the proposed powerline routes due to the narrow nature of the valley between the Whetstone Mountains and the Catalina Mountains. Rural qualities are highly valued in our tri-community area of-6, Mescal, and Skyline as we serve as the western gateway to the San Pedro Valley and to Cochise County that markets its scenic vistas, remote recreational opportunities, western-movie production, and legendary history. Having parallel lines of 130' to 160' imposing towers is not conducive to the passive setting, experiences being marketed. Due to the topography of the valley, the powerline would be a visual scar that is seen and felt for miles.</p>	
1268	<p>Please accept and fully consider these scoping comments on the proposed SunZia transmission project on behalf of the Empire-Fagan Coalition, an organization dedicated to education and preservation in the Empire-Fagan Valley-southeast of Tucson. We appreciate your continued consideration of additional routes for SunZia and providing the opportunity to comment. Although Empire-Fagan's comments are targeted to the southeastern portion of the proposed "Tucson" area alternatives, (links F-43, F-60, F-110 and F-120 attachments 22-23 and 12) we concur with current environmental concerns about alternatives through Aravaipa Canyon and the San Pedro Valley as presented by The Wilderness Society, Sonoran Institute, Cascabel Working Group and others.</p>	
1298	<p>The destruction of our property values and public/private lands to accommodate extremely dangerous high-tension lines erected along the I-10 corridor between Benson and Tucson, Arizona to promote a partnership deal between New Mexico and California, is outrageous. It has always been our understanding, wind and solar power generation is best created in the local vicinity of the user, and not transported over long distances. If California's current policies do not allow for the construction of power generation in their own state, they need to re-think those policies to accommodate their needs.</p> <p>California has a history of transporting all the resources they demand, for their own use, from other states without regard to the inconvenience or impact this causes others.</p> <p>With proper thought and planning, Sunzia Southwest can utilize high-voltage paths already in existence from Magdalena and Socorro, New Mexico through Springerville and Holbrook, Arizona, rather than creating havoc for property owners and businesses along the I-10 corridor.</p> <p>Any plan that calls for the use along transportation corridors (utilities/railroad and/or transportation right-of-way) between Benson and Tucson will cut through developed residential communities, displacing many local residents. This would have a negative financial impact on this area; and, the potential for delaying the entire project in court for many years.</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1310	<p>Impact on the Extension Area of WSMR</p> <p>I am particularly concerned with the route proposed as E80, E90 &amp; E100. These sections pass between the launch site known as LC94 and the radar and optics sites. This site was the initial research and testing to improve the patriot missile that was used last year to destroy a de-orbiting satellite with pinpoint accuracy. What impact will the power line have on the communications needed to operate the launch site? Would it force WSMR to shut down the facility? What mitigating measures could be taken to alleviate the interference? This same area is also used for night flights by helicopters flying from Kirtland Air Force Base to WSMR for training exercises. Would the magnetic field from the line interfere with the electronics on the helicopters? Also these flights are low flying. Would the line pass a physical danger and what could be done to mitigate that danger?</p> <p>Financial Impact</p> <p>The ranchers in the extension area of WSMR also have contracts with the range both for the sites and possible impacts from stray missiles from the main missile range. If the power line causes WSMR to cancel or alter those contracts, what compensation would we expect? This size line also has to reduce the value of the ranch [in Mountainair, NM] as a unit and the private land would be greatly affected. What studies have been done to try and quantify that loss of value? Is there a differentiation between sub dividable land and rangeland?</p> <p>Ecological Impact</p> <p>Why would you choose to run a large set of power lines thru some 1500 square miles of pristine area? These areas from Bernardo to Gran Quivira, south to Highway 380, to the Rio Grande River have no highways, no large power lines, no radio relay towers, in fact no development other then LC94 site operated by the WSMR on a site of 40 acres. It would also pass between the stallion WSA, with a view shed rating of 2 and the south boundary of the Sevilleta refuge. In fact it parallels the Sevilleta for the entire south boundary of the Sevilleta and would be visible from the entire upper part of the refuge.</p>	
1313	<p>It has come to my attention that a potential routing alignment for a SunZia transmission line is in consideration which would dissect our 4600 acre Master Planned Community Willow Springs. For obvious reasons we would be opposed to this location because we feel that the aesthetical impact would significantly diminish the future value of our project. I have attached our Marketing Plan so you could get a sense for the Projects goals. Please let me know if you or someone else would be willing to discuss the status of your alignments in relation to Willow Springs.</p>	
1341	<p>According to one resident, proposed relocated line locations may impact visual resources in the vicinity of Gran Quivira, a historic site that is part of the Salinas Pueblo Missions National Monument, and Deer Canyon Preserve [Mountainair, NM].</p>	
1345	<p>Salinas Pueblo Missions National Monument</p> <p>Potential Impact: Visual impacts that the proposed above-ground lines</p>	National Park Service

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>will have on Gran Quivira’s historic view shed. Gran Quivira was the sixth National Monument designated in the United States and is eligible for the National Register as a National Historic Landmark (NHL) under all eligibility criteria, exhibiting exceptional integrity. The newly finished Cultural Landscape Inventory for Gran Quivira specifically identifies the site’s location, setting, and feeling as integral aspects contributing to the integrity of Gran Quivira’s National Register eligible cultural landscape. Due to the close proximity of more than one of the alternative proposed lines and the nature of the surrounding landscape, the construction of above ground transmission lines would introduce visual elements that are out of character with the property’s historic setting and would subsequently result in significant visual impacts. The proposed placement of either of these nearby transmission line routes would constitute an adverse action under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (under Criteria of Effect 36 CFR, § 800.5 a5 as an introduction of visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property’s significant historic features) to the core significance of Gran Quivira.</p>	
1400	<p>My husband and I both grew up back east. We raised a family there. We learned of the beauty of what New Mexico had to offer when our son attended college here. We learned about the Preserve through the internet. We visited Mountainair and the Preserve and liked the type of life we saw here. When contemplating retirement we remembered the Preserve and came to the look at property on the Preserve. In 2009 we built our dream home and moved to the Preserve. This area, is filled with ruins, i.e., ABO, Gran Quivira, etc. When visiting these places, if you close your eyes you can see the missions come to life. Living on the Preserve offers a very easy way of living. There are nature trails to hike, there are birds to watch there is life happening all over and there are incredibly beautiful views to take in. If one has horses they can ride on the Preserve. We have magnificent long homed cattle. Unfortunately all of this can change if Sun Zia decides to run either through or very close to the borders of Deer Canyon Preserve. The BLM maps illustrate alternative routes These newly proposed alternative routes appear to run through the Liberty Valley, within sight of the Gran Quivira Mission ruins. What a tragedy to allow this to happen .The environmental impact would be devastating to all concerned, animals, people and the ruins. It would literally change an otherwise perfect landscape. These sites must be protected from further development of such projects.</p>	
1442	<p>As a property owner in the Deer Canyon Preserve, I am concerned about the possible route of the transmission lines for the Sun Zia Southwest Transmission Project. I feel that Deer Canyon and Gran Quivira are the type of resources that should be protected from these types of invasive projects.</p>	
<b>CODE 031.01 Eloy (Avoid/Concerns for Area)</b>		
917	<p>Should not be C830, C620, C690, C301, C273, C470, C450 – environmentally sensitive archeological sites, wildlife, beauty, people, children, home, etc. I-10 corridor is better.</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
<b>CODE 031.02 San Pedro River Valley (Avoid/Concerns for Area)</b>		
880	As a former resident of Cascabel as well as a former preserve manager of the Muleshoe Ranch, I oppose the proposed routes for the transmission lines through the greater Cascabel area. This area is a rich Sonoran Desert ecosystem with desert tortoises, bighorn sheep, and a variety of other wildlife that would be impacted by the project. Please use existing disturbed corridors for the location of this project.	
881	SunZia lines should be kept out of the San Pedro Valley. New power transmission corridors should instead be placed along already established rail and highway corridors. The construction and maintenance of the proposed SunZia transmission lines would impact water and wildlife resources in SE Arizona, already under stress, and undermine property values and eco-tourism opportunities in the area.	
908	Proposed segment C276 would deface the central scenic focus of the Cascabel community – the set of cliffs along the west side of the San Pedro River. The cliffs have the following significance:  1. Unique spectacular scenery – unique in the San Pedro Valley; riddled with attractive slot canyons.	
909	I am a conservation land owner in the San Pedro River Valley. The cultural, environmental and eco-economic resources of the San Pedro far outweigh any value 2 500kV lines might provide the area, or state. Irreplaceable archeology would be lost. A wilderness area from Sulfer [sic] Springs Valley to Tucson, Benson to San Manuel, would be fractured by roads and thus numerous washes/watersheds subject to erosion and extended ORV use. The San Pedro is a critical flyway for migratory birds, over half of bird species are in sharp decline due in part to increased collisions with power lines and towers. The middle San Pedro River Valley must be considered as a whole, intact ecologically integral system. Dividing it into its constituent parts to study the impact of the lines denies its true value as an irreplaceable ecosystem – one of the few remaining sensitive desert areas of the Southwest. Please consider the region as whole in the EIS. No routes through the length of the SPRV meet any reasonable measure of acceptable impact in trade for transmission lines.  Urban routes should be moved to the top of the list for consideration. 1.) construction in already disturbed/environmentally comprised areas. 2.) bring power to power users.	
910	However, the San Pedro River Valley appears to be an optimum choice for that region. The Valley at one time did have farming and ranching, but water resources have essentially taken care of those industries. Sites are abandoned with old irrigation pipe in many areas. The cattle that I have seen are near starving – I am surprised that the Agriculture Dept. has not gotten on their cases.  Ignore the comments, if you can, of the county administrator. He is really opposed to any development anywhere for any purpose.	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
912	As several other commentators have noted, I support the development of facilities which make feasible the connection of renewable fuel-generated electricity to the electric network. However, transmission lines have many adverse impacts. Thus, the proposed line should be located in areas of least environmental and cultural impact; in particular, avoid San Pedro Valley. It seems common-sensical to focus on those corridors already disturbed by transportation and industrial development specifically avoid C273, C276, C441 and other northern alignments which encroach on San Pedro Valley and focus on C260/F40 and alignments south of Tucson along I-10 and then following I-10 into Pinal County.	
914	I know this project will have a lot of "Not in my backyard!" reaction. However, as a Tucson resident, I would rather have a pylon actually in my backyard than anywhere in the San Pedro River Valley. Why San Pedro would even be considered is beyond me – one of the last undammed rivers, with only a small dirt road going through some of the last undamaged desert areas is the Southwest. It is especially confusing when the already damaged I-10 corridor goes to the exact place the lines are trying to reach. I am so glad that Tucson route is now being considered!	
915	<p>The San Pedro River Valley is a major migration corridor for many species of birds and animals. Disturbing this area would be shameful and an insult to future generations. Following I-10 and other developed areas will have more legal issues obviously but much less environmental and political issues.</p> <p>The Galiuro wilderness, in combination with the San Pedro, creates such a beautiful valley that to tough it would be such a shame. We need areas to get away from the works of man and get back to nature. Continued development and projects such as this are a major threat to that.</p>	
918	I have commented to the Bureau about my opposition to using the San Pedro area as a route for this project, which has a direct negative impact on environmental, current ranching lifestyle, and animal behavior. It would seem to me that this project is better suited to use an existing thoroughfare such as I-10 than creating havoc in a pristine area.	
921	<p>Thank you very much for opening up the scoping process and for adding Tucson routes into the project area as potential routes.</p> <p>I would urge you to seriously consider running such a transmission line through Tucson rather than the San Pedro River Valley. The San Pedro is a fragile and irreplaceable archeological landscape in the valley. A powerline would cause both direct and indirect effects on those features. Tucson's cultural sites and ecosystem are already fragmented. If there must be a line, put it through Tucson.</p>	
925	<p>If this is to be build near Albuquerque, then it should use existing corridors, (ie I-10) not the San Pedro or Aravaipa.</p> <p>If Tucson and Phoenix need more power, they should accept the visual, psychological, and environmental consequences of that need. It's ethical.</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
934	Please add my voice to those who oppose any San Pedro Valley route. As a hospice nurse in Tucson I use this peaceful, beautiful valley with its magnificent vistas to restore my spirit in order to do the difficult work of companioning the dying. There are few places left anywhere that contain the solitude present there. Let the noise and towers follow the highways if even at greater monetary expense.	Cascabel Hermitage Association
938	Under no circumstances should any SunZia lines pass through the San Pedro Watershed! The San Pedro Watershed shelters numbers of birds, fish, mammals, and other species virtually unparalleled in the United States. The San Pedro is one of the most important migratory bird corridors in North America while collision or electrocution by powerlines is the single greatest human-related killer of birds each year in the US. The list of threatened, endangered, and candidate species in the San Pedro Valley's [illegible] and many of them would be adversely impacted by habitat fragmentation, erosion, stream sedimentation, spread of invasive species along access roads, etc. I will be providing more extensive and scientifically documented comments in May, but priority of this and all new transmission projects should be given to routes following I-10 or through other disturbed areas. The route following the Rillito and Pantano washes east and north through Tucson seems especially promising. You might also look again at a northern AZ route that would pass through the Apache Reservation. The lower San Pedro Watershed should be a candidate for landscape conservation, not for fragmentation by SunZia lines. We will stop fighting to keep these lines out of the San Pedro.	
939	I oppose the proposed routes for the SunZia Southwest Transmission project in southern Arizona through the San Pedro River Valley, or in any other area that would be irreparably impacted environmentally, ecologically, and culturally.  The BLM holds a conservation easement on several properties to protect its ecological and cultural values. As a land owner in Cascabel (130 acres at the mouth of Hot Springs Canyon w/conservation easement), I am concerned that running a 1,000-ft utility corridor through the area is inconsistent with the BLM's own state conservation goals in the San Pedro River Valley. New roads, development, and infrastructure would cause irreparable damage to this fragile area.	
942	Honestly, I would prefer an energy shortage in my home to the damage that could be done to the San Pedro River Valley. I realize the possible benefits that could come from connections to renewable energy sources yet I cannot comprehend how those benefits could outweigh the costs from the devastation of a fragile ecosystem. Please find another route that would have less devastating consequences.	
943	After having reviewed the information about the project presented here today, I believe it makes the most sense to choose one of the alternatives that closely follows the existing I-10 corridor and skirts Tucson to the south. This would minimize the impact on important natural resources in southern Arizona, including the San Pedro Valley and Aravaipa Valley and canyon. Constructing the transmission line through these sensitive natural areas would unnecessarily expose them to habitat degradation	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	and future development, forever damaging them and diminishing their value as pristine refuges from the city.	
946	If you put up power lines in Cascabel, it will make more places erode, kill a lot of birds and let invasive species in. Cascabel won't be Cascabel if you put your power lines up in it.	
952	<p>We attended the scoping meeting regarding the SunZia Transmission Project held on April 29th at the Holiday Inn on Palo Verde Rd in Tucson, AZ. Saguaro Juniper Corporation has donated conservation easements on its deeded land in the San Pedro Valley to The Nature Conservancy because of the land's environmental importance. Apparently to avoid lands with conservation easements, the new proposed SunZia routes go around the deeded land in Sections 7 and 8 T13S R20E either to the north and east or to the south and west – staying on Arizona State Land (Routes C301-C331, C310-C311-C331, C275-C321-C341). This ignores the fact that the state land is as important environmentally as the adjacent private land with conservation easements. In particular, route C301 crosses directly over Willow Spring (which is not on the topo map, but is an important water for wildlife). Willow Spring is in Sierra Blanca Wash just downstream from Hackberry Spring and Sierra Blanca Spring, both of which are shown on the Soza Mesa 7.5 min Quad. Together the three springs form very important riparian habitat and make Sierra Blanca Wash an important wildlife corridor. After crossing Sierra Blanca Wash the line would go through a beautiful and unique basin which we call either the Notch Basin or Henderson Basin. This basin drains through an unusual geological feature we call the Notch into Pool Wash. C301 apparently would go either right through or adjacent to the notch. There are two other intermittent springs, not shown on the topo map (Cottonwood Spring and Muleshoe Spring) that enrich the entire area biologically. Essentially the entire area traversed by C301, C311, and C331 around Sierra Blanca Peak from Sierra Blanca Wash to Hot Springs Canyon is complicated geologically and rich biologically. It should be avoided in route selection.</p>	
955	<p>I have a really specific thing I want to address, that is the Segment No. C276 which cuts across the San Pedro River right in the Casterville community. The proposed route for that is very problematic to me and other people in the community because it carves up one of the principal scenic focuses of the community. There's a set of rather spectacular cliffs that the river has cut into the basin filled sediments, west side of the river and east side. The sediment goes straight up the cliffs, so they put a road up the cliffs. It's what you see as sort of the principal identifying feature of that area as you drive through Casterville. Scenically, it's unique through the San Pedro River.</p>	
993	<p>It's unsound practice to create new corridors of development when existing routes will accommodate added infrastructure. The proposal's to direct these transmission lines over the Galiuro Mtns and/or through the San Pedro River Valley should be dismissed out-of-hand for their complete disregard for the natural and social values of the landscapes they would trample.</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
994	I am writing to voice my opposition to SunZia's proposed high-power transmission route through Arizona's wilderness areas, including both Aravaipa and San Pedro. Our wilderness areas should not be sacrificed in order to provide an energy source for other states.	
1034	I've read about the SunZia Transmission Project and offer these thoughts: 1. No route for the Project should be considered except routes already ecologically damaged by extant energy transmission equipment, such as in the 1-10 corridor. 2. It seems obvious that installing hundreds of huge transmission towers in the San Pedro Valley – with its attendant bulldozing, tree removal, road construction, etc.– has to be a profit-driven idea rather than a function of ecological sanity.	
1038	In general, all the routes through the San Pedro River Valley are problematic, especially those along the river and along the foothills of the Santa Catalina Mountains on the westside. One route, C500 and C470, could be feasible with substantive mitigation and siting evaluation. Finally, all routes crossing the San Pedro River (e.g., C170, C591, and C620 near the Department's property) are of concern.	Arizona Game and Fish Department
1045	The Sunzia Transmission Line Project appears to be a necessary project and could be beneficial for many areas of Cochise County including the San Simon and the Bowie areas. District 3 also includes a large portion of the San Pedro River Valley and as the representative of that area I would encourage the BLM to keep the Sunzia route to existing transmission or utility corridors that already cross the San Pedro and would oppose any new North/South transmission corridor.	Cochise County (AZ) Supervisor
1047	The San Pedro River Valley, on the east side of the Rincon Mountain District of the Park, is an important wildlife corridor and link to other protected natural areas such as the Galiuro and Redfield Canyon Wilderness Areas. Saguaro National Park receives over 700,000 visitors to the park each year from all over the world, generating over \$23 million in visitor spending. In combination with the Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum and Pima County's Tucson Mountain Park west of Interstate 10, millions of visitors and citizens rely on these areas for rest, recreation, solace, and education about our unique Sonoran Desert resources. We cannot afford to alter this landscape.  We respectfully request that the potential corridors shown west of the park's west boundary, as well as the potential San Pedro River Valley corridor east of the park's east boundary, be removed from consideration. We support either the No Action alternative, or location of the transmission lines well north of the city of Tucson, bypassing the city altogether.	National Park Service – Saguaro National Park
1058	We anticipate that the Pantano Wash-Rillito River route would have appreciable impacts to aquatic, mesoriparian, and xeroriparian resources in the named streams. The Cienega Creek/Pantano Wash stream channel is critical habitat for the federally endangered Gila chub ( <i>Gila intermedia</i> ), and individuals of the species occur upstream. Endangered	US Fish and Wildlife Service

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>Gila topminnow have been documented at a diversion near where Pantano Wash enters the far eastern portions of Tucson. The federally endangered Huachuca water umbel (<i>Lilaeopsis schaffleriana</i> var. <i>recurva</i>) occurs upstream in Cienega Creek; the species could also persist in the perennial, shallow-water conditions at the diversion.</p> <p>The Service has appreciable concerns with all routes that involve the clearing of rights-of-ways across presently wild or lightly-disturbed lands, especially those routes that move through or cross sensitive lands within the San Pedro River Valley. As noted above, numerous land conservation efforts have been accomplished and are ongoing in the San Pedro River Valley. We recommend that a route situated as close as possible to the Interstate 10 corridor through the Tucson metropolitan area be selected.</p>	
1068	<p><i>Excerpt from:</i>  <i>Redington Natural Resource Conservation District Long Range Plan, 1989</i></p> <p>Policy: Major Utility/Transportation/Communication Corridors 2010 Background</p> <p>The lands within the Redington Natural Resource Conservation District include valuable agricultural production acres as well as lands that are historically and culturally significant. The Lower San Pedro River valley is well known as an important migratory flyway and unfragmented wildlife corridor between the Galiuro, Catalina, and Rincon Mountain ranges.</p> <p>Agricultural production supports the local tax base and helps to ensure continued open space. Current utility lines and access roads have created environmental concerns in the form of soil erosion, water quality degradation, and increased off road vehicle damage to the watershed.</p> <p>There is a minimum of private land still withheld in the District; that which provides the tax base supporting local school districts and county services, maintains undeveloped riparian areas and associated state/federal grazing leases providing active management of the natural resources upon them and further support for educational institutions. There are properties within the District considered to be mitigation lands purchased with the specific intention of providing habitat for specific species in order to mitigate land use actions in other areas. Negating this mitigation action would result in the need for further land purchases leading to more acres taken out of production, affecting the local economy.</p> <p>Any new major utility/transportation construction would adversely affect the above mentioned resources by promoting further land fragmentation, loss of private ownership, the possible destruction of valued cultural and historic resources, disturbance of soil and degradation of water quality as well as affect the ability of landowners to steward their properties and produce essential products for the benefit of the people of the District, the State of Arizona, and the Country.</p> <p>The Lower San Pedro River Watershed Assessment funded through the AZ Water Protection Fund found roads to be a major issue of concern with area landowners as related to problems of erosion and other</p>	Redington Natural Resources Conservation District

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>resource impacts. Roads associated with existing utilities were included in the determination that roads were considered to be the number one cause of human related gully erosion. These roads interrupt surface runoff and cause it to run down the road eventually leading to gully cuts along tracks in the road. Also reflected in this assessment was that 34-54% of the watershed falls within a low to moderate soil stability rating, meaning that these soils are more vulnerable to soil instability.</p> <p>Policy</p> <p>It is the policy of the Redington Natural Resource Conservation District to oppose the construction of any new major energy, transportation, or communication corridors through the Redington NRCD. In order to minimize impacts of such actions all future construction of such corridors should be along existing corridors of similar capabilities that would only require an upgrade from what currently exists.</p>	
1081	<p>If this project is really proposing to support the major energy markets, then it should work with the major energy market in the region it passes through. Routing through Tucson and more coordination with Tucson Power Electric Company will allow more local access to power in these lines and make much more efficient use of existing infrastructure corridors. It will avoid permanent damage to wilderness areas in the Galiuro Mountains and the riparian ecology of the San Pedro River.</p>	
1110	<p>Use Existing Information to Identify and Remove Routes with Known Impacts to Significant Cultural Resources</p> <p>We appreciate BLM’s identification of cultural resource priority areas based on information we and others have submitted. Unfortunately we are unable to discern how this information has influenced the design or consideration of proposed alignments. In particular, we draw your attention to the following line segments: C170, C400, C420, C430, C440, C443, C450, C460, C530, C540, C590, C790, F450, F461, F470, and F440. These routes, in particular, traverse cultural resource priority areas that have already been identified by CDA and despite the information provided no removal or re-alignment of these linkages has occurred since the beginning of the scoping process.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Remove line segments C170, C400, C420, C430, C440, C443, C450, C460, C530, C540, C590, C790, F450, F461, F470, and F440 from further project consideration.</p> <p><i>Remove the Lower San Pedro and Upper Aravaipa areas of Arizona from Project Consideration.</i></p> <p>We believe that the information that has been generated through the scoping process much of which is presented on your website, amplifies our earlier and continuing concerns regarding the significant resources at risk in Arizona from the alignments proposed for the lower San Pedro and Upper Aravaipa areas. We consider the impacts to cultural resources in these areas to be unacceptable under any “mitigation” scenario, so we strongly encourage you to drop these alignments from further consideration.</p> <p>Recommendation: Remove all alignments through the Lower San Pedro and Upper Aravaipa areas of Arizona from consideration for the</p>	Center for Desert Archaeology; National Trust for Historic Preservation

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	proposed project.	
1121	As a member of the Cascabel Working Group [of the San Pedro River Valley], I have extensively analyzed central Tucson routes for the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project and am attaching a copy of my report. I have attempted to look at these routes as objectively as possible and suggest alternatives to make them more viable. I understand the enormous difficulty of finding a workable Tucson route and hope this will be helpful.	
1175	I am writing to express my belief that routing the proposed SunZia transmission lines, with associated towers and roads, through the San Pedro Valley would be wrong. Further, it would be the kind of action that future generations will look back on as an unforgiveable act of disregard for the health of the world we share with each other ...This valley is one of the last remaining corridors in the Southwest which is more or less intact and available to animal and plant life for growth and dispersal. To alter it in the way proposed by the SunZia project would be unforgiveable.	
1231	It is not appropriate to bisect the cluster of Wilderness Areas in the Galiuro Mountain region or damage the massive conservations efforts in the San Pedro riparian zone for the sake of corporate or mega-metropolitan interests.	
1258	Building a new major infrastructure corridor in the environmentally sensitive areas of the Aravaipa and San Pedro regions would cause permanent damage to our dwindling wilderness areas in southern Arizona, as well as loss of wildlife habitat and wildlife migration corridors.	
1259	If the transmission towers are to be built at all, they should never be routed in the San Pedro River valley. I worry further that huge projects such as this one will be seen by some as holding out the possibility that we Americans can continue the unsustainable way of life we see today which has resulted in so much irrevocable damage to earth, air, and water, and in terrible species extinctions and poor prospects for the futures of all of us.	
1275	<p>Potential Legal Challenges</p> <p>The three principal alternative southern Arizona routes (excluding central Tucson) chosen for the SunZia Project – Aravaipa, San Pedro Valley, and Avra Valley – were also selected three years ago as possible routes for an 1-10 bypass around Tucson. All three were vehemently opposed by residents and conservationists, who now find themselves facing the same challenges again.</p> <p>These three routes have reemerged as the only prospective paths for another large-scale development project.</p> <p>In assessing SunZia's initial routes for the project, the Wilderness Society and associated environmental organizations focused on the impact of crossing the Galiuro Mountains south of Aravaipa Canyon without providing an assessment of the San Pedro Valley as well. This, I think, led SunZia to believe that the San Pedro Valley was less sensitive</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>environmentally and a more plausible route for the project. In reality, the San Pedro Valley is much more prominent nationally for its conservation value than the Aravaipa area, and the valley is the focus of continued protection efforts by national organizations. If either the Aravaipa or San Pedro route were chosen, environmental groups would, I believe, legally challenge this no matter what goodwill SunZia has worked to achieve with the environmental community.</p> <p>Choosing either route is not merely a matter of angering someone and then proceeding with the project. Doing so would likely result in a protracted legal battle that would delay the project. These groups would also likely appeal any ruling against them to progressively higher courts.</p>	
1304	<p>I am strongly opposed to the SunZia Project through the San Pedro Valley and Aravaipa watersheds. These precious wilderness sites are home to an immense and irreplaceable array of wildlife and unique botanical species. Conservation is called for, NOT destruction.</p>	
1308	<p>It is important to note that neither the Cascabel Working Group, nor the evidence of this document, is taking a position in opposition to the SunZia transmission line project per se. The need for renewable energy is significant and urgent, and the degree to which the SunZia project participates in that effort is laudable. It is only urged that, in the rush to renewable energy for the sake of the human and natural environment, we not sacrifice non-renewable natural resources of global significance in the process. In so far as the SunZia project proceeds, we propose that present energy corridors that are already ecologically compromised be pursued in favor of ones such as the SPRV [San Pedro River Valley] that would severely impact our natural environmental heritage.</p>	Cascabel Working Group
1336	<p>I am writing to comment about the proposed construction of two 500-kilovolt power lines along the San Pedro River Valley. The San Pedro River corridor is internationally recognized as an Important Bird Area. Preservation of undisturbed habitat along the San Pedro is crucial for the 350 species of birds and 87 species of mammals who use this area for migration and breeding.</p> <p>Riparian corridors are fast disappearing throughout Arizona and the rest of the United States. The San Pedro Watershed is such a treasure that its protection should be the highest priority for the BLM.</p>	
1347	<p>The main beneficiaries of power from this project would be the urban growth centers of the Southwest, including Tucson and Phoenix. A route for a project that mainly benefits urban growth centers must follow established corridors that connect these centers. It must NOT fragment our few remaining intact ecological systems, such as the Middle and Lower San Pedro watersheds and the Galiuro Mountains.</p>	
1348	<p>The San Pedro River Valley supports the last major free flowing river in the desert southwest, the main migratory corridor for neo-tropical birds in the West, and the greatest diversity of mammal species in North America. The Rocky Mountains, Sierra Madres, Sonoran and Chihuahuan deserts all merge here to create the greatest biodiversity of any landlocked area in the U.S. The Middle San Pedro River Valley, adjacent ranges and areas is one of the largest intact landscapes in the</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	lower 48 states.	
1370	Not everyone in Cascabel is against progress. We ...have lived here for going on eighteen years, and we approve of the power line. We think that it is kind of silly to site environmental reasons. Granted, there may be some aesthetic issues, but some sacrifices are sometimes necessary for our overall progress.	
1381	<p>San Pedro Valley</p> <p>This proposed route is also unacceptable and unreasonable and should be removed from further consideration. The San Pedro River Valley supports one of the last major free-flowing rivers in the desert southwest and, as such, is important habitat for many species and a key migratory corridor for neo-tropical birds. It is a world-renowned birding area and an important tourist destination. The San Pedro also supports the greatest diversity of mammal species in North America, including mountain lion, black bear, coatimundi, javelina, fox, coyote, badger, three skunk species, mule and white-tail deer, ringtail cat, raccoon, bobcat, beaver, porcupine, black-tailed prairie dog and 24 species of bats as well as many other smaller or lesser known mammal species. In addition, the San Pedro River Valley provides habitat for a great diversity of avifauna and is an important migratory flyway. Just south of the proposed SunZia transmission line crossing areas is the San Pedro Riparian National Conservation Area, established by Congress to protect important habitat. During the last 20 years, the high quality riparian habitat coupled with the unfragmented nature of the lower valley has resulted in many lands being acquired for biological mitigation purposes. Most notable is the 7B ranch owned by Resolution Copper Company and proposed for land exchange with the federal government in recently introduced legislation by Congresswoman Kirkpatrick and Senator John McCain. Two of the proposed San Pedro alignments will go through the ranch lands or in close proximity.</p> <p>In addition to the outstanding ecological values of the San Pedro River Valley, the lower valley represents ones of the most intact prehistoric, cultural landscapes in southern Arizona, if not the whole Southwest. A full range of cultural sites can be found in the area, providing a record of human history that spans 2,000 years. This rich cultural landscape remains under constant threat of residential and commercial development, as well as looting and vandalism. The latter is exacerbated by increased vehicular access, as demonstrated by impacts to sites located in close proximity to the 138-kV line operated by Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative whose numerous access routes have become a magnet for off-road vehicle travel. A transmission project of the size proposed by SunZia and its related construction and maintenance access routes will greatly increase unauthorized traffic in the area which will also increase the risk of looting and vandalism to these prehistoric sites.</p> <p>We encourage the BLM to recognize the significant and negative impacts the San Pedro and Aravaipa routes in Arizona would have on wildlife, cultural, and wilderness resources, and to drop those routes from further consideration.</p>	Sierra Club, et. al.

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1396	San Pedro Valley Transmission Line Corridor. I have attached my February 17, 2010 letter to you regarding the modified alternative routes and subsequent elimination of the route through the Bingham Cienega Natural Preserve. While elimination of this route is supported, the County expressed continued concerns over the proposed alternative route cutting through County managed State grazing lease lands that are part of the A7 Ranch purchased with voter-approved bond monies. Concerns include the route cutting through important conservation areas, wildlife travel corridors, major A7 Ranch roads and pastures. The County manages the ongoing ranching operations, while conserving and protecting the ecological values of the lands. Please refer to the attached letter for complete comments on this transmission line corridor.	Pima County (AZ)
<b>CODE 031.03 Galiuro Wilderness (Avoid/Concerns for Area)</b>		
915	Following I-10 and other developed areas will have more legal issues obviously but much less environmental and political issues. The Galiuro wilderness, in combination with the San Pedro, creates such a beautiful valley that to tough it would be such a shame. We need areas to get away from the works of man and get back to nature. Continued development and projects such as this are a major threat to that.	
993	It's unsound practice to create new corridors of development when existing routes will accommodate added infrastructure. The proposal's to direct these transmission lines over the Galiuro Mtns and/or through the San Pedro River Valley should be dismissed out-of-hand for their complete disregard for the natural and social values of the landscapes they would trample. What is the reason that such unwarranted despoilation can even be considered? For the convenience of private individuals' desire for profit, are we to allow areas of natural and agricultural abundance to be degrade, compromised, industrialized? When there already exists in the I-10 corridor every manor [sic] of transportation?	
1038	A section of C170, where it crosses the northern end of the Galiuro Mountains, would negatively impact a considerable amount of roadless areas and is of particular concern to the Department. A route through this area would require substantive coordination with the Department on siting, construction by helicopter only, and mitigation to compensate for current and future damages to wildlife and habitat.	Arizona Game and Fish Department
1050	I am writing to express my outrage over the concept of the proposed SunZia transmission lines crossing through the Santa Terresa and Galiuro mountains as proposed on the maps for the project. I can assure you sir that these routes are completely inappropriate for such use and those of us that hold these wild areas precious will fight forever to keep them in their current wild state.	
1058	Our primary concern with the SR 191-US 70-Galiuro Mountain route is that it traverses between the Galiuro and Santa Maria mountains near the headwaters of Aravaipa Creek. This area presently has limited road access, and we anticipate the placement of a transmission line through this region would necessitate impacting an appreciable acreage of currently wild lands. Aravaipa Creek currently supports seven species of	US Fish and Wildlife Service

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>native fishes including longfin dace (<i>Agosia chrysogaster</i>), roundtail chub (<i>Gila robusta</i>), speckled dace (<i>Rhinichthys osculus</i>), desert sucker (<i>Pantosteus clarkii</i>), Sonora sucker (<i>Catostomus insignis</i>), spikedace (<i>Medafulgida</i>), and loach minnow (<i>Tiaroga cobitis</i>), with Gila topminnow (<i>Poeciliopsis occidentalis occidentalis</i>) and desert pupfish (<i>Cyprinodon macularis</i>) present in the watershed. The latter four species are federally listed as threatened or endangered. Threatened Chiricahua leopard frogs (<i>Lithobates chiricahuensis</i>) occur in the eastern Galiuro Mountains. While relatively distant from the likely alignment, impacts to aquatic sites in the northern Galiuro Mountains could affect the ability for the species to expand its range northward.</p> <p>Transmission line construction and maintenance could affect the federally threatened Mexican spotted owl (<i>Strix occidentalis lucida</i>), which occurs not only in forested areas, but also at unusually low elevations in the expanded study area's canyons. Mexican spotted owl critical habitat exists in both the Galiuro and Santa Teresa mountains. We believe the Galiuro Mountains' north-south orientation east of the San Pedro River Valley may indicate that the range is used by southward migrating raptors in the autumn.</p> <p>The SR 191-US 70-Galiuro Mountain route also appears to traverse the lower slopes and foothills of the western Galiuro Mountains, an area supporting a robust community of saguaro cactus (<i>Carnegie gigantea</i>). Saguaro cactus blossoms are a forage resource for the federally endangered lesser long-nosed bat (<i>Leptonycteris yerbabuenae</i>), and the plants are a nest substrate for the cactus ferruginous pygmy-owl (<i>Glaucidium brasilianum cactorum</i>), formerly listed as federally endangered and currently under review by the Service. We would be concerned over the clearing of this habitat as well as the indirect effects of increased access and invasion by injurious, nonnative plants.</p> <p>As described in our March 11, 2010, memorandum, the SR 191-US 70-Galiuro Mountain route crosses the lower San Pedro River in a reach supporting: (1) critical habitat for the spikedace; (2) a large breeding population of southwestern willow flycatchers, including critical habitat; and, (3) substantial conservation lands, many of which were acquired specifically to conserve the latter species in perpetuity and promote their recovery. In addition, the Service is currently exploring the feasibility of establishing a new NWR on the lower San Pedro River.</p>	
1081	<p>Routing through Tucson and more coordination with Tucson Power Electric Company will allow more local access to power in these lines and make much more efficient use of existing infrastructure corridors. It will avoid permanent damage to wilderness areas in the Galiuro Mountains and the riparian ecology of the San Pedro River. The Aravaipa/Galliuros wilderness areas should not be used as source of cheap public land in order to maximize corporate profits and control of energy resources for the project sponsors.</p>	
1084	<p>It is not appropriate to bisect the cluster of Wilderness Areas in the Galiuro Mountain region or damage the massive conservations efforts in the San Pedro riparian zone for the sake of corporate or mega-metropolitan interests.</p>	
1038	<p>This unfragmented landscape of the MSPRV [Middle San Pedro River</p>	Cascabel Working

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	Valley] was, for example, a major rationale in Pima County's acquisition of the A-7 Ranch which extends from the Rincon and Santa Catalina mountains to the valley floor and SPR. As stated in the plan, "The overall biological goal in this subarea adopted by the Science Technical Advisory Team is to protect native plants, animals and natural communities of the Middle San Pedro River throughout Pima County by maintaining and/or restoring ecological and evolutionary processes that sustain them within a largely unfragmented landscape." It was also articulated as one of their conservation strategies: "Maintain relatively unfragmented landscape connections between the Rincon, Santa Catalina, Galiuro and Winchester mountain ranges and through the San Pedro River valley that facilitate movement of wide-ranging wildlife species to meet seasonal and annual life requirements and for genetic interchange."	Group
1316	I am writing today to let you know that it is not acceptable to sacrifice our wilderness areas in order to meet the energy needs of the large urban growth centers, that it is not acceptable to introduce a new major infrastructure corridor that will bisect and eventually fragment the wildlife connections that extend from the San Carlos Reservation south through the Aravaipa and Santa Teresa Wilderness Areas, and then further south into the wilderness land of the Galiuro Mountains. There exists a 100-mile-long stretch of land, extending from the San Carlos Apache Reservation all the way south through Gila, Pinal, and Graham Counties to northern Cochise County, containing a network of wildlife trails that has never been interrupted by a motorized vehicle road, one of the last remaining wildlife migration corridors of this type and magnitude in the Southwest. This project would open the gates to human development by setting a major precedent for disturbing the wild and open country of the Galiuros.	
1335	It will avoid permanent damage to wilderness areas in the Galiuro Mountains and the riparian ecology of the San Pedro River. The Aravaipa/Galiuros wilderness areas should not be used as source of cheap public land in order to maximize corporate profits and control of energy resources for the project sponsors.	
1347	A route for a project that mainly benefits urban growth centers must follow established corridors that connect these centers. It must NOT fragment our few remaining intact ecological systems, such as the Middle and Lower San Pedro watersheds and the Galiuro Mountains.	
1353	The proposed route would block the road-less wildlife migration corridor between the Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness and the Galiuro Wilderness in the Coronado National Forest, one of the last of this magnitude in the southwest. The importance of this 100-mile long corridor has not been taken into account because for some unknown reason the study area stops just north of the Galiuros and does not include the road-less areas to the north. This is an essential corridor for many animals, such as desert bighorn sheep, black bears, mountain lions, and mule deer, and it connects these two ecologically pristine areas.	Aravaipa Property Owners Association

<b>Table E-1 Comments Summary Table</b>		
<b>ID</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>AFFILIATION</b>
<b>CODE 031.04 Sunset Mountain (Avoid/Concerns for Area)</b>		
	NONE	
<b>CODE 031.05 Sulphur Springs Valley (Avoid/Concerns for Area)</b>		
1038	The proposed route (CI30, 140, 150, 171) through the Sulphur Springs Valley would have an immediate and substantive impact on wildlife and habitat. Additionally, the route could have a cumulative effect of attracting additional power projects or other developments.	Arizona Game and Fish Department
<b>CODE 031.06 Aravaipa/Klondyke (Avoid/Concerns for Area)</b>		
922	The northern route through the Aravaipa would be a huge mistake. The area is pristine supporting natural plant and wildlife. 500 high voltage lines through this area would open roads in areas that when it rains would destroy with erosion all the area around the disturbed ground. There are ranches in that area that have kept the area intact, and all the wildlife and plant life undisturbed. Opening access roads encourage ATV's etc. My suggestion is to follow lines already in place.	Eureka Springs Property Owners Association
923	My concern would be for the habitat of all animal life as well of the utilization of roads for ATV travel and further deteriorating of the fragile environment. Once scarred this land soil will [illegible] erode and cause washing and major erosion. Finally, at a ranch property once on Klondyke Road/Eureka Springs property. There would be the concern for reception around 2 parallel 500 kilovolt transmission lines should we need emergency assistance or require relocation for other electronic equipment.	
928	Regarding the proposed alternate route through the Aravaipa Valley. My family has been there since 1920s. Beyond the sentimental reasons, the logic for considering this area does not exist. If we are talking impacts to a rich and diverse natural area. Other more valuable routes exist, such as the I-10 corridor. It is already an environmentally and visually disturbed area.	
935	If this is truly a green story for "green power" than choose a "green route" one that does not denegated the wilderness experience for Arizona residents now and for a lifetime. No routes through the San Pedro, no routes through Aravaipa wilderness, utilize I-10 route.	
1025	I am an Arizona native from Tucson, and have recently bought land in High Point Ranch 8 Miles south of Klondyke, AZ. There are approx 66 sections of land with no water, electric, gas, or phone lines to the properties, and minimal traffic. We do not organize as a homeowner association until June 19, 2010, so you have not heard from approx 66 new land owners about our views on a by way with tall transmission towers, road construction, possible dense housing for the workers and all of the new businesses that would follow, just to bring power from New Mexico to Casa Grande to benefit California, Utah, Las Vegas, etc. This cheap land is pristine and has always since the 1800's been very sparsely	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

<b>ID</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>AFFILIATION</b>
	populated and should be for many reasons – for Indian sites, riparian areas, clean air, little crime, dark skies, for astronomy. Do not destroy our heritage to suit your selfish needs.	
1048	I am writing to voice my opposition to SunZia's proposed high-power transmission route through the Aravaipa Valley, or through any other Arizona wilderness area. Our state's wilderness areas should not be sacrificed in order to provide an energy source for other states. Arizona residents will benefit minimally from this plan, while bearing the brunt of the environmental impact.	
1050	I am writing to express my outrage over the concept of the proposed SunZia transmission lines crossing through the Santa Teresa and Galiuro mountains as proposed on the maps for the project. I can assure you sir that these routes are completely inappropriate for such use and those of us that hold these wild areas precious will fight forever to keep them in their current wild state. That any person would deem it appropriate to foul such an important wildlife corridor with such a project speaks to the complete lack of understanding of the nature and importance of this area. And to destroy such an area in the quest for "green" energy is an even greater insult.	
1058	The SR 191-US 70-Galiuro Mountain route also appears to traverse the lower slopes and foothills of the western Galiuro Mountains, an area supporting a robust community of saguaro cactus ( <i>Carnegia gigantea</i> ). Saguaro cactus blossoms are a forage resource for the federally endangered lesser long-nosed bat ( <i>Leptonycteris yerbabuenae</i> ), and the plants are a nest substrate for the cactus ferruginous pygmy-owl ( <i>Glaucidium brasilianum cactorum</i> ), formerly listed as federally endangered and currently under review by the Service. We would be concerned over the clearing of this habitat as well as the indirect effects of increased access and invasion by injurious, nonnative plants.	US Fish and Wildlife Service
1110	Remove the Lower San Pedro and Upper Aravaipa areas of Arizona from Project Consideration. We believe that the information that has been generated through the scoping process much of which is presented on your website, amplifies our earlier and continuing concerns regarding the significant resources at risk in Arizona from the alignments proposed for the lower San Pedro and Upper Aravaipa areas. We consider the impacts to cultural resources in these areas to be unacceptable under any “mitigation” scenario, so we strongly encourage you to drop these alignments from further consideration.	Center for Desert Archaeology; National Trust for Historic Preservation
1140	We cannot continue, in this country, to take ever more land in an undeveloped or limited development state and cover it with utility lines and roads, no matter how that might affect the cost of such a project. Several of the proposed alternative routes for these transmission lines traverse just such land. From what I can tell, one such line proceeds north along the east side of the Pinalinos Mountains, past Mount Graham and then proceeds west, probably through the pass between the Santa Teresa Mountains and the Pinalinos. Another alternative proceeds north through the Aravaipa Creek area and west through the northern reaches of the Galiuros Mountains.	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>Mount Graham, Aravaipa Creek, the Aravaipa Wilderness and the Galiuros Wilderness could all be adversely affected by the construction of these lines. Moving to the west, the map in your meeting advertisement indicates potential alternative lines up the San Pedro River Valley, a sensitive and threatened riparian area, which would be even more threatened by such an encroachment of development.</p> <p>My hope is that, as you develop an EIS for this project, you look at already developed areas, such as those in the proposed expansion corridors along I-10 or along existing power transmission lines, and find that development in more sensitive areas should be off the table.</p>	
1200	<p>I urge your group to recommend protection of the Aravaipa Corridor from disturbance due to the construction of the Sun Zia high power transmission lines which will encourage roads and/or wildcat roads over State Trust and Federal National Forest lands. Reasons:</p> <p>a. I oppose a new corridor being opened that could cross:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• heritage areas</li> <li>• wildlife corridors</li> <li>• our remaining designated or non-designated Wilderness areas in the Aravaipa riparian areas will be disturbed.</li> <li>• already threatened Arizona Prime Tourism areas.</li> <li>• Phoenix has already seen a fifteen year decline in tourism revenues because Phoenix has lost the special draw of Arizona Uniqueness. The San Pedro/Aravaipa riparian areas and adjacent canyons are a unique Arizona magnet for Tourism. It has managed off-roading, fishing, hiking, mountain bicycling, river rafting, hunting due to high-impact scenery that monthly graces our publication, the Arizona Highways magazine.</li> <li>• threaten precious remaining prime riparian areas where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Central Arizona has very little pristine wildlife, ranching and watercourse areas left. These dwindling riparian areas form the backbone of wildlife corridors.</li> <li>○ Preserving crucial wildlife is ensured by maintaining real corridors. Corridors must be in various levels of non-undisturbed states depending on the wildlife affected.</li> <li>○ Arizona is a preferred destination for tourists, eco-tourists, birders and hunters from all over the world.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
1225	<p>I am a member of the Board of Directors of Apaches of Aravaipa Canyon, Inc., a 501 (c) (3) dedicated to conserving and interpreting the natural and historic site of what has been called the Camp Grant Massacre.</p> <p>This site, which occupies some 200 acres in the Aravaipa wilderness, once served as the home base of the Aravaipa Apache, whose name in Apache is in fact is taken from the Canyon's black rocks. As you can imagine, the Aravaipa wilderness is very sacred to the Apache people. As the site too of a terrible massacre carried out against Apache women,</p>	Apaches of Aravaipa Canyon, Inc

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>children and elders, it also has an important historic dimension for the Apache people – and for the people of the United States as a whole, as the event was to have a profound impact on our relations with Native peoples and shape who we later become as a nation.</p> <p>Having giant transmission lines run near the Canyon would irreparably harm the pristine nature of the site and in so doing destroy its historic character and beyond that degrade the sacred burial site, where the bodies of the 200 Apache civilians slain during the massacre still lie.</p> <p>The fact that Aravaipa remains a "wilderness" is something of a rarity and worthy of special consideration. In preserving its natural beauty, we preserve its sacred cultural and historic character as well.</p>	
1258	<p>Building a new major infrastructure corridor in the environmentally sensitive areas of the Aravaipa and San Pedro regions would cause permanent damage to our dwindling wilderness areas in southern Arizona, as well as loss of wildlife habitat and wildlife migration corridors.</p>	
1260	<p>I am writing to voice my objection to the proposed use of the Aravaipa Valley as a corridor for power lines. This is a sacred area to the Apache people who still own land allotments in this valley. It is the site of the Camp Grant Massacre and a National Historical Landmark where 120 Apache women and children (victims of the Camp Grant Massacre) are buried on the Mesa top. The Non profit organization Apaches of Aravaipa Canyon is raising money to create a cultural center at the massacre site to tell the story of this historical event. You may check our website at <a href="http://www.apachestelltheirstory.com">www.apachestelltheirstory.com</a></p>	Apaches of Aravaipa Canyon
1261	<p>I am a senior and internationally known conservation biologist at Arizona State University. I and my scientific colleagues at ASU and the University of Arizona have been conducting research in Aravaipa Canyon and the surrounding tablelands for many years and are strongly opposed to having these transmission lines going through the Aravaipa watershed. (Note that I am writing this as a private citizen, not as an employee of ASU, and mention my association with ASU to signify the widespread opposition to using the Aravaipa route in the scientific community at ASU, UA, and elsewhere.) Because of the short notice about the change in preference to Aravaipa, I have only been able to briefly talk to and email some of my colleagues. But if BLM recommends the Aravaipa route, I can promise you large opposition from the scientific and environmental community.</p> <p>Recently, I have been studying the bighorn sheep population in Aravaipa. This population has provided the largest hunter-harvested desert bighorn sheep ever. Human activity and habitat modification associated with the transmission lines would greatly impact this unique bighorn sheep population. In other words, if BLM recommends the Aravaipa route, I can also promise you large opposition from the hunting community.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to remove the Aravaipa route from any further consideration as a route for the transmission line and, as a more environmentally conscious alternative, use either of the proposed Tucson routes or other Tucson routes, which could be developed.</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1262	<p>I oppose erecting power transmission lines through sensitive wilderness areas such as Aravaipa and the San Pedro River valley because of the potential to disturb wildlife and degrade the beauty of this remote area. If such a transmission line is necessary, it should follow a route that has already been developed such as Interstate 10. However, I believe a preferable solution is to generate the power at a source closer to the region where it will be consumed.</p>	
1264	<p>I oppose erecting power transmission lines through sensitive wilderness areas such as Aravaipa and the San Pedro River valley. These are the only remaining riparian wilderness areas in Southern Arizona, and the proposed project will destroy them.</p> <p>It does not matter how many precautions the designers and builders take. The project will encourage development of roads, off-road vehicle intrusions, and completely unnecessary "development" into these areas, which can only result in the disruption of active wildlife corridors and highly complex and sensitive ecosystems. In other words, the project will slaughter a complex of plant and animal life that will never be found anywhere else.</p> <p>The issue here is not electric power, because there are plenty of alternative ways to provide it and distribute it. The issue is the survival of the San Pedro and Aravaipa river valleys. If you allow these places to become as urbanized, fragmented, polluted, and homogenized as so much of the rest of Southern Arizona already is, there will be no further natural beauty left.</p>	
1276	<p>I write to register my deep concern about the possibility of transmission lines from the Sun Zia Project being run through Aravaipa Canyon in Arizona. This is an extremely rare and fragile ecology. Moreover, it is a site of unparalleled historical import, containing the remains of O'odham villages, a U.S. Army fort, and several Western Apache sites (including the site of the Camp Grant Massacre, one of the most important, if less known, historic sites in Arizona history). It would be a tremendous tragedy to damage this location any further.</p>	
1279	<p>As a resident of Southern Arizona and Tucson, I have to express my deep concerns about some of the proposed routes for the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project. I am especially distressed that the route through the wilderness area in the Aravaipa area seems to be the preferred route at the moment. The fact that this area has fewer human residents and thus you receive fewer "NIMBY" complaints does not make this area less worthy of your protection. (The route through the San Pedro area would also be very undesirable, but as that area has a strong advocacy group and seems to have been removed from serious consideration, my comments will focus on the Aravaipa route.) The Aravaipa area is a part of a large, relatively undisturbed (and roadless) wilderness area. It is a migration route and haven for many animals that would not thrive with much human encroachment. Not only would the construction and presence of the power lines cause substantial disturbance in itself, but it would open a much easier path for subsequent destruction such as that which would be caused by ATVs. Such traffic would be unavoidable once the access road and clearing that would</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	necessarily accompany the power lines are built. Humans who currently have access to this area by backpacking, tend to have a much greater respect for and a much lower impact on nature than those who might gain entry on motorized vehicles. Once desecrated, it will be much more difficult to successfully oppose further development and roads in the area, and another pristine wilderness area and much of its fauna will be lost.	
1334	I own 70 Acres in the Aravaipa Canyon, Arizona. This is a Wilderness area, according to the United States of America, and must remain in the condition that exist today. The project you are seeking to use to destroy our Canyon is not to be tolerated.	
1337	Having been a resident of lower Aravaipa Creek in Pinal County, Arizona for over fifty years, I am very much against the Aravaipa Valley being desecrated by a high power transmission line.	
1353	<p>We, the Aravaipa Property Owners Association (APOA), are writing you to express our strong and unanimous opposition to the Aravaipa transmission line route proposed by the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project. This route cuts through more than 20 miles of the Aravaipa Canyon watershed, crosses Aravaipa Creek on the east side of the Canyon, and bisects the Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness administered by the Bureau of Land Management to the north and Galiuro Wilderness in the Coronado National Forest to the south. Aravaipa Creek is a perennial creek in the Sonoran Desert that flows through the wilderness and the area in which the APOA members live. Aravaipa Creek is home to two federally threatened fish species, the spikedace and the loach minnow, and is the only watercourse in Arizona still to have all its' native fish species. Other species of special concern in the creek and nearby are four other fishes (longfin dace, roundtail chub, desert sucker, and Sonoran sucker), three bird species (yellow-billed cuckoo, gray hawk, and black hawk), the desert tortoise, and the desert bighorn sheep. In other words, Aravaipa Canyon and its watershed constitute a unique environment and an ecologically sensitive area. In fact, the Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness has been called the "crown jewel" of the wilderness areas administrated by BLM.</p> <p>Protection of the special aspects of this environment is a very high priority for APOA and the proposed transmission line route would threaten the Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness in a number of ways.</p> <p>(1) The proposed route would block the road-less wildlife migration corridor between the Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness and the Galiuro Wilderness in the Coronado National Forest, one of the last of this magnitude in the southwest. The importance of this 100-mile long corridor has not been taken into account because for some unknown reason the study area stops just north of the Galiuros and does not include the road-less areas to the north. This is an essential corridor for many animals, such as desert bighorn sheep, black bears, mountain lions, and mule deer, and it connects these two ecologically pristine areas. Overall, approximately 50 miles of the proposed route would pass through or within one mile of areas determined to be environmentally sensitive, the largest number of miles in this category of all the</p>	Aravaipa Property Owners Association

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>transmission line routes, proposed or alternative. More importantly, once the transmission lines are in place with their attendant maintenance access, they will act like a “gateway drug” to further access, first by off-road vehicles, then to more development and degradation.</p> <p>(2) The proposed route would cross or closely parallel Aravaipa Creek on the east side of the wilderness and cross the Aravaipa Creek watershed for much of its length, potentially destroying and altering habitat important to native species.</p> <p>(3) The proposed route includes more than 15 miles of mountainous terrain, making construction difficult, unduly expensive, environmentally degrading, and very undesirable for maintenance.</p>	
1359	<p>My husband and I are landowners in Aravaipa Canyon, and we hope to retire there. As such, I am gravely concerned about SunZia’s proposed high power transmission routes through our beautiful area. It strikes me as immensely hypocritical that an energy project devoted to delivering “green” energy would willingly efface millions of acres of wilderness.</p> <p>We are submitting these comments on the proposed SunZia Transmission Project on behalf of the Sierra Club’s Grand Canyon (Arizona) Chapter, Defenders of Wildlife, the Center for Biological Diversity, the Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection, Arizona Wilderness Coalition, Tucson Audubon Society, and the Center for Desert Archaeology.</p> <p>Aravaipa Canyon Transmission Routes</p> <p>This proposed route is unacceptable and unreasonable and should be removed from further consideration. It would impact the Aravaipa Canyon watershed by cutting through it for more than 20 miles, crossing Aravaipa Creek, and fragmenting connectivity between two wilderness areas – Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness and Galiuro Wilderness. This area is one of the largest unfragmented wildland blocks in southern Arizona. A new transmission corridor would impair wilderness characteristics and values and would likely lead to unintended and undesirable impacts to this intact wildland complex.</p> <p>The proposed Aravaipa route passes within two miles of the Aravaipa Wilderness boundary. The intervening two miles contain roads that are recommended for closure and lands that are recommended as an "Area to be Managed for Wilderness Characteristics" in a Sky Island Alliance report. This same report contains a citizens-proposal for Wilderness Additions to the existing Galiuro Wilderness Area managed by the Coronado National Forest, which together with the sensitive BLM lands to the north, constitute a priority area for wildlands protection and maintenance of north-south ecological connectivity.</p>	
1381	<p>Aravaipa Creek supports a lush riparian community and provides important habitat for numerous species of wildlife, including various species of bats, coatimundi, leopard frogs, and mountain lions, among many others. A 17-mile stretch of Aravaipa Creek is perennial and provides some of the best native fish habitat in Arizona, supporting seven species of native fish, including the federally listed threatened spikedace and loach minnow. Although the upper and lower portions of the creek are intermittent and ephemeral, they continue to support</p>	Sierra Club et al

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>important riparian vegetation and provide habitat for many wildlife species.</p> <p>According to the BLM, more than 150 species of birds have been documented in the Aravaipa Wilderness, including the peregrine falcon, common black-hawk, bald eagle, cactus ferruginous pygmy-owl, and southwestern willow flycatcher. Because of this, the area is also popular for birding. Aravaipa also supports recreational opportunities for hikers, backpackers, and wildlife watchers, among others.</p> <p>The proposed route bisects one of only two priority cultural resource areas in the Upper Aravaipa Valley and would fragment an important connection between the Galiuro Wilderness located in the Coronado National Forest and the Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness located on BLM lands.</p> <p>Construction of a large transmission line involves developing temporary construction roads as well as a permanent road under the line. This causes significant habitat fragmentation and invites off-road vehicles. Roads and motorized uses can have serious detrimental effects on habitats and wildlife.</p> <p>These effects include direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts, ranging from mortality from collisions with vehicles, modification of animal behaviors, altered use of habitats, facilitation of the spread of exotic, invasive, and parasitic species, adverse genetic effects, and fragmentation of connected habitats.</p> <p>Further road-building, construction, and improved off-road vehicle access in this area will also contribute to erosion and sedimentation that could travel downstream through tributaries and impact threatened native fish populations and other species in Aravaipa Canyon, over 20 of which are designated with some sort of special status.</p>	
<b>CODE 031.07 Cluff Ranch (Avoid/Concerns for Area)</b>		
1038	Evaluate the feasibility of a new, more northern route (on C10) to avoid crossing the Department's Cluff Ranch Wildlife Area.	Arizona Game and Fish Department
<b>CODE 031.08 Mt. Graham/Safford (Avoid/Concerns for Area)</b>		
1140	<p>The fact that the proposed transmission lines would carry electricity produced by solar and wind is not material to my comment. We cannot continue, in this country, to take ever more land in an undeveloped or limited development state and cover it with utility lines and roads, no matter how that might affect the cost of such a project. Several of the proposed alternative routes for these transmission lines traverse just such land. From what I can tell, one such line proceeds north along the east side of the Pinalinos Mountains, past Mount Graham and then proceeds west, probably through the pass between the Santa Teresa Mountains and the Pinalinos. Another alternative proceeds north through the Aravaipa Creek area and west through the northern reaches of the Galiuros Mountains. Mount Graham, Aravaipa Creek, the Aravaipa Wilderness and the Galiuros Wilderness could all be adversely affected by the construction of these lines.</p>	

<b>Table E-1 Comments Summary Table</b>		
<b>ID</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>AFFILIATION</b>
<b>CODE 031.09 US 191 So. of Safford (Avoid/Concerns for Area)</b>		
	NONE	
<b>CODE 031.10 Deming (Avoid/Concerns for Area)</b>		
	NONE	
<b>CODE 031.11 Bosque del Apache/San Antonio (Avoid/Concerns for Area)</b>		
887	The proposed route running north to south just west of Bosquecito Rd is totally unacceptable to me – it would [illegible] my viewscape and lower my property value.	
896	A-130 and A-140 routes run right by my house and farm. This power line would be eye sore and devalue property value and make it difficult to sell. This power line would disturb all forms of wildlife that includes endangered species (ie., silvery minnow, fly catcher, golden eagles plus migratory birds.) The power company should bury the line. The balloon festival would present hazards for people running into the power lines.	
899	Socorro County is the second poorest county in NM. It's primary source of income (besides employees at Stallion) is generated by ecotourism. People come here to enjoy the vast scenic vistas. This project has the potential to destroy a major source of income as well as impact a major migratory flyway. I am opposed to the concept of destroying our vistas, impacting our wildlife to benefit AZ and CA. I see all the "could be" potential. But bottom line is NM will lose a way of life we all treasure to benefit someone's pockets. This concept is a travesty.	
962	My wife and I have been visiting the Bosque del Apache for years. We love this place, and we're very concerned to hear about the possible erection of huge transmission lines for the NMSunZiaProject. Our concerns are two-fold: the effect of this project on the tens of thousands of birds and other wildlife that use the Bosque as their refuge; and the potential adverse impact of the project and its visual blight on tourism and, thus, the economy. We understand the need for energy transmission, but we are opposed to the placement of transmission lines through or adjacent to the Bosque.	
1008	While we believe the best pathway for this entire 460 miles of 500kv transmission line, fair and suitable to the people and wildlife of New Mexico, is simply underground, we do recognize this as cost prohibitive. However, portions of this transmission line must go underground: especially all or portions of the originally proposed "A30-40-80" lines from SunZia-East Substation continuing west to San Antonio along Route 380. The following resources serve as a list of impacts and reasons for the removal of the "E" lines from further consideration as well as for the proposed "A 30-40-80" lines being installed underground:  Natural Environment Wildlife	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p align="center">Migratory birds (Bosque Del Apache Refuge) Endangered and threatened wildlife (Sevilleta Refuge)</p>	
1032	<p>The proposed line to the East of the White Sands Missile Range is the only choice that provides for minimizing the massive negative impact of the project on the critical flyways of the Bosque del Apache Wildlife Refuge.</p>	
1042	<p>Although I support the construction of a new power line to support "green power" I believe this line should run along routes to the east and south and NOT along the Rio Grande Corridor flyway. Routes with valley crossings between Socorro and Belen would pose a great hazard to the seasonal and daily flight patterns of the Sandhill Cranes and Snow Geese as well as the hundreds of thousands of birds that migrate along this route.</p> <p>River crossings and valley transmission lines will kill many avifauna that already suffer from reduced and threatened populations due to habitat loss and climate change relative to global warming.</p> <p>The route along the eastern boundary of White Sands is the most feasible, I believe. Any route through the Sevilleta National Wildlife Refuge, the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge and the Rio Grande Corridor is absurd and completely abusive.</p>	
1058	<p>The Service believes that either of the two alternative routes provided in the October 7,2009, expanded study area are preferable alternatives to any route that crosses the Rio Grande in the reach north of the Bosque del Apache NWR and in the vicinity of the Sevilleta NWR. The crossings of the Rio Grande in the Las Cruces area and below Caballo Reservoir are in reaches of limited riparian habitat and less bird use of the Rio Grande corridor.</p>	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1069	<p>I am a member of the Friends of the Bosque and I join with them in requesting you to consider the alternative line, other than any which cross over the Bosque del Apache in order to preserve the beauty and utility of the Bosque.</p>	
1078	<p>Concerning the proposed route for SunZia's powerline across the northern ends of Socorro and Polvadera, I strongly urge you to reconsider the corridor proposed in SunZia's original 2008 filing, which follows White Sand's western fence line. I agree with the Fish and Wildlife Service that this western boundary route is the most reasonable in that it protects wildlife along the Rio Grande flyway and has the least impact on our communities.</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1138	<p>As a member of the Friends of the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge, and life time resident of New Mexico having raised my children and now grand children here in New Mexico, want to go on record in support of the Friends of the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge position as stated below with regards to the proposed expanded study area for the Sun Zia Project 500 kv power transmission line between AZ &amp; NM. Having studied the proposed routes on the BLM web site and my familiarity with the eastern boundary route along White Sands I believe this is the only acceptable route for the project. The land areas adjacent to the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge must receive the same respect, preservation and protection as the National Wildlife Refuge regarding future land development.</p>	
1146	<p>One of the possible routes you have proposed for the SunZia 500 KV power lines passes through San Acacia, Polvadera, and/or Lemitar in Socorro County. I strongly object to your using this corridor and ask that you use one of your alternate corridors instead. All things considered, the corridor(s) along White Sands would seem to be far better alternatives.</p> <p>My objection is based on (1) scientific evidence indicating possible links between EMFs and childhood leukemia, fibromyalgia, Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's, migraine headaches, sleep disorders, allergies, and asthma; (2) degradation of local property values because of potential buyers' concerns about health, neighborhood aesthetics, quality of life and diminished resale value; (3) possible negative effects on the migratory, reproductive and nesting behavior of the tens (hundreds?) of thousands of birds which migrate here annually; and (4) associated negative effects on the bird centered tourist industry in the City of Socorro, the Bosque del Apache and surrounding communities.</p>	
1150	<p>I would like to express my opposition to the building of a power transmission line that will impact the wildlife, in particular the migratory bird life, of the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge in any way.</p> <p>I am not a resident of New Mexico, and your decision will not affect my property value. However, as a frequent traveler to New Mexico, and to the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge in particular, I can see that your decision will make a decided impact on not only the wildlife, but on the tourist economy of that part of the state.</p>	
1151	<p>I respectfully request that the BLM only approve a plan that does NOT cross the Bosque del Apache NWR in anyway, compromise the agricultural fields that provide necessary feed for migratory birds, or cross the Rio Grande River in the migratory flight path of birds such as the Sandhill Crane. There are alternative choices such as on the east side of White Sands Missile Range that would result in substantially less impact on wildlife and the environment.</p> <p>The whole idea of a wildlife refuge is just that – it's a refuge from humans and human activity, including powerlines. The focus of our decisions needs to renewable energy with minimal impact on wildlife and their habitat.</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1153	Please know that I am among numerous visitors to Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge who are distressed to learn that the fragile integrity of that wildlife would be threatened by unanswered concerns regarding the Rio Grande Valley power transmission corridor. Daily flight plans will be compromised, the landscape will be scarred for miles and the tourist industry, therefore, at risk.	
1251	As members of Friends of Bosque del Apache, we are writing to oppose the current plan by SunZia. We would like to see the removal of the possibility of routes near the refuge, the incorporation of an underground river option, and the removal of all threats to migratory birds with any proposed additional routes.  SunZia should acknowledge the more suitable routes to the east and south and obtain the appropriate scientific support and data to demonstrate minimal environmental impact.	
1256	I'm a strong supporter of green energy, and just as strong on protecting migratory birds. The Sun Zia line running by the Bosque del Apache would create a major hazard for the migratory birds in one of their prime habitats. I would like to know the projected electrocution kill of raptors, which are the birds most likely to perch on lines, and likely impact kills on non-raptors.	
1311	When friends visit from out of state, we take them to the Bosque del Apache. It is at the Bosque del Apache that we often run across tourists who have come from Canada, Europe, and other countries for the world-renowned migratory pathway.  When we are there, along the river, in the fields, and along the trails we always note the beautiful ABSENCE of visible power lines, poles, signs, etc. I often think I have been allowed to travel back in time to New Mexico as it might have looked 150-200 years ago. If you were to install power lines anywhere near this area you would ruin pristine land and views that provide needed respite for animals and people. Please find another route or means to accomplish the transmission of power in this part of the state. Please leave this area untrammled.	
1312	I am emailing to ask you to protect the irreplaceable Bosque del Apache from plans by SunZia to build a power transmission corridor that would impact this beautiful place. Please don't let another corporate plan for power and profit destroy what is truly special about New Mexico. I can't help but think of the Gulf of Mexico and the oil spill when I consider yet another plan to put our environment at risk. Please do what you can to protect and preserve the Bosque. It is an amazing and unique place and brings many visitors and tourists to the state of New Mexico.	
1322	President Roosevelt set aside Bosque del Apache as a sanctuary for migratory wildlife in 1935. I can not believe that anyone or any group would propose or even consider a transmission project that would destroy 75 years of work by man to protect the migratory wildlife.  I agree with Bosque del Apache that an eastern route through the edge of White Sands is a more feasible route for the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project.	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1326	<p>I am completely opposed to the idea of putting high-power lines over the Rio Grande anywhere near Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge. The most logical and least expensive alternative is to cross the river somewhere between Hatch and Las Cruces where in some areas the river runs narrowly between two high bluffs. From there the lines should run north close to the San Andres mountains and west of the White Sands Missile Range. This is a situation where the U.S. Military establishment really needs to cooperate so that renewable power from wind and solar installations in eastern New Mexico can be delivered efficiently and at minimal cost to the population centers in Arizona.</p>	
1331	<p>As a long-term visitor to the Bosque del Apache refuge south of Socorro, I urge you to avoid routing the line through flyways for sandhill and whooping cranes. Especially, I urge you to avoid crossing the Rio Grande at any point north of the refuge or routing the line close the river north of the refuge.</p>	
1332	<p>As a member of Friends of the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge and a faithful annual visitor to this precious Refuge, I convey opposition to the proposed SunZia study area expansions because it still does not provide routes to protect wildlife and the economy of that local area. Routes with valley crossings still pose a hazard to daily flights and the migration of Sandhill Cranes and hundreds of thousands of other birds.</p> <p>The needed energy structures will also permanently mar the natural landscape I visit every year as a paying tourist to the local community of Socorro, and unless this natural beauty is preserved, I and tens of thousands of other tourists would find no purpose to visit there and spend money.</p>	
1338	<p>Properly sited to avoid impacts to sensitive wildlife habitat, wildlands, and the Rio Grande river corridor, the SunZia line could help meet our clean energy and climate goals by providing access to wind and solar projects in New Mexico and Arizona.</p> <p>The Important Bird Area program, coordinated in the U.S. by the National Audubon Society and in other parts of the world by Bird Life International, enables scientists to identify places essential to birds for breeding, wintering or migrating. New Mexico currently has 62 IBAs which include sites like Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge, Ladd S. Gordon Waterfowl Complex (composed of the Belen, Casa Colorada, Bernardo, and La Joya Waterfowl Areas), Rio Grande Nature Center, the Gila Bird Area along the Gila River, Valles Caldera National Preserve, and Otero Mesa.</p> <p><i>The Middle Rio Grande Valley – Critical for Migratory Birds</i></p> <p>Audubon has concerns about the impacts of the SunZia transmission line on the Rio Grande, particularly with the Middle Rio Grande Valley and the specific route along New Mexico Highway 380, crossing the Rio Grande three miles north of the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge. Because of unacceptable impacts to migrating Sandhill Cranes and other important birds and wildlife, BLM should not select any routes crossing the Rio Grande near the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife</p>	Audubon New Mexico

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	Refuge or in the Middle Rio Grande Valley, unless environmental analysis shows that running the line underground in this area would sufficiently limit impacts.	
1343	We understand that Climate change represents an unprecedented threat to fish and wildlife and the NMWF is a strong supporter of legislation that would put a cap on greenhouse gasses and set renewable energy standards. Developing renewable sources of energy is critical to mitigating the impacts that a warming climate is having on our wildlife. The infrastructure for renewable energy, however, like the proposed SunZia transmission lines, must be sited in a way that won't negatively impact the wildlife. It would be incredibly shortsighted to address one threat to wildlife while creating yet another. The Rio Grande may be the most important wildlife corridor in New Mexico.	New Mexico Wildlife Federation
1368	<p>We have reviewed the route alternatives map and specifically recommend Route numbers A181 and A300 (or alternately, A250) as the Proposed Route for the SunZia DEIS:</p> <p>The route cuts diagonally west-southwest from the new sub-station north of Carrizozo, past the northwest corner of White Sands Missile Range (WSMR) property just south of Highway 380, where it turns immediately south, following the WSMR boundary to the point where the line must head west in order to cross the Rio Grande just south of Arrey, NM.</p> <p>There are several reasons that this route makes the most sense, [including]: It avoids the low-altitude migratory avian flyway along the Rio Grande. The Rio Grande Flyway is a critical migratory corridor for greater Sandhill Cranes and Snowgeese (among other species) that stretches from northern Canada (for the Snowgeese) and Grey Lake Idaho (for Sandhill Cranes) southward to Bosque del Apache NWR south of Socorro, and this waterfowl population has been recognized to be negatively impacted in recent years by development and human encroachment. In fact, RGALT has been working since 2004 with the USFWS Intermountain West Joint Venture group using North American Wetlands Conservation Act (NAWCA) grant funds to preserve habitat, including working farms in the middle Rio Grande Valley down to Bosque del Apache NWR. Constructing a powerline across this corridor would create yet another threat to the Rio Grande Flyway migrants.</p>	Rio Grande Agricultural Land Trust
1374	We are particularly concerned that the proposed crossing of the SunZia Transmission Line just north of the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge will have an undue and avoidable impact on the rich wildlife resources of the Rio Grande Valley. Any crossing of the Rio Grande will entail significant impacts to migrating bird populations and other wildlife. The route crossing at Highway 380 just north of Bosque del Apache is particularly egregious in its effect on the Rocky Mountain population of Sandhill Cranes.	Sangre de Cristo Audubon Society
1381	<i>Sevilleta and Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuges</i> Proposed routes across (E60/E70, E120) and adjacent to (E20, E100, E110, A102, A111, A130, A140, A160)) these two National Wildlife Refuge units are unacceptable due to high levels of conflict with	Sierra Club et. al.

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>sensitive resources and the conservation mission and goals of the National Wildlife Refuge System:</p> <p>“The Mission of the National Wildlife Refuge System is to administer a national network of lands and waters for the conservation, management, and where appropriate, restoration of the fish, wildlife, and plant resources and their habitats within the United States for the benefit of present and future generations of Americans.” The Rio Grande River is a well-documented bird migration corridor that could be impaired by aboveground high voltage transmission lines. The presence of transmission lines crossing this river corridor in or adjacent to these wildlife refuges present a serious conflict that would be difficult, if not impossible, to mitigate.</p>	
<b>CODE 031.12 Rio Grande Corridor (Avoid/Concerns for Area)</b>		
888	<p>The Rio Grande Agricultural Land Trust (RGALT) holds conservation easements on nearly 400 acres of farmland and riparian habitat in the middle Rio Grande. Project managers need to know where our easements are! We are legally bound to take legal action against projects like the power line.</p>	Rio Grande Agricultural Land Trust
898	<p>Conservation easements along the Rio Grande need to be protected. Migratory birds need to be protected. These lines destroy what we have protected for decades.</p>	
990	<p>[T]here is an area of the Rio Grande south of Hatch where there's a narrow canyon, agricultural fields on either side the river and mesas on both east and west of the river where there could be an overhead crossing. And I don't know whether anybody has considered that possibility, but it's about 14 to 15 miles southeast of Hatch, right along the river. And there's a stretch – I don't know – two or three miles where there's no agriculture because it's a narrow canyon , and that is a possible place where the crossing could be done overhead without risking a lot for the birds that might use the river, because there should be minimal use of the river by the birds since there's no fields there.</p>	
1013	<p>I would like to go on record as opposing the proposed study area expansion of the power transmission corridor. The Middle Rio Grande valley is a rural area that is, as yet, unmarred by massive power lines. We are fortunate to still have an environment that is conducive to migratory birds and other wildlife. There is no benefit to local landowners.</p>	
1042	<p>Although I support the construction of a new power line to support "green power" I believe this line should run along routes to the east and south and NOT along the Rio Grande Corridor flyway.</p>	
1058	<p>In summary, the Service prefers an alternative route in New Mexico that crosses the Rio Grande to the south of Bosque del Apache NWR and south of the Caballo Reservoir or in the Las Cruces area. These alternatives would lessen the impacts to migratory birds and riparian habitats.</p>	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1078	Concerning the proposed route for SunZia's powerline across the northern ends of Socorro and Polvadera, I strongly urge you to reconsider the corridor proposed in SunZia's original 2008 filing, which follows White Sand's western fence line. I agree with the Fish and Wildlife Service that this western boundary route is the most reasonable in that it protects wildlife along the Rio Grande flyway and has the least impact on our communities.	
1151	I respectfully request that the BLM only approve a plan that does NOT cross the Bosque del Apache NWR in anyway, compromise the agricultural fields that provide necessary feed for migratory birds, or cross the Rio Grande River in the migratory flight path of birds such as the Sandhill Crane. There are alternative choices such as on the east side of White Sands Missile Range that would result in substantially less impact on wildlife and the environment. The whole idea of a wildlife refuge is just that – it's a refuge from humans and human activity, including powerlines. The focus of our decisions needs to renewable energy with minimal impact on wildlife and their habitat.	
1179	I am in opposition of any route configurations that ignore flyway and view scape issues. SunZia must acknowledge the more suitable routes to the east and south and obtain the appropriate scientific support and data to demonstrate minimal environmental impact. It has been demonstrated that better route and underground placement are feasible and not cost-prohibitive; now SunZia must make the responsible decision not to bulldoze through the small community and wildlife that cannot handle and do not want this project.  Routes with valley crossings between Socorro and Belen would still pose a hazard to the daily flight patterns of sandhill cranes and snow geese, as well as the migratory pathway for hundreds of thousands of other birds.	
1328	The SunZia transmission line and the windmills associated with it must not degrade the land (especially public land) or the wildlife that live on it. If the powerline must be built then the best route would be as far away from sensitive wildlife habitat and the Rio Grande as possible. Riparian habitats are among the most productive and ecologically diverse habitats in North America. They provide the essential food and water for numerous species of migratory birds and other species. These same riparian habitats have suffered the greatest losses due to human development and are among the most endangered habitats in North America. The Rio Grande is the major north/south bird migration corridor in the western United States. Powerlines are notorious for killing and injuring birds, therefore the placement of this powerline is extremely important.	Mesilla Valley Audubon Society
1343	The Rio Grande may be the most important wildlife corridor in New Mexico. Many species of birds and butterflies migrate hundreds and thousands of miles up and down the Rio Grande. The Rio Grande and other important wildlife corridors in New Mexico are becoming increasingly fragmented and the NMWF along with many other agencies and organizations is committed to better understanding, documenting	New Mexico Wildlife Federation

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>and protecting these corridors. Transmission lines crossing the Rio Grande will undoubtedly have significant impacts to migrating bird populations and other wildlife because they will physically bifurcate this passageway...For these reasons, all the proposed crossings of the Rio Grande are problematic, especially the proposed route crossing at Highway 380 just north of Bosque del Apache.</p> <p>In our opinion, the best route for the SunZia line is on the east side of White Sands Missile Range.</p>	
1374	<p>The state and federal wildlife refuges and the associated managed agricultural crops along the Rio Grande, planted specifically for daily forage for wintering cranes and waterfowl, represent a significant investment in the middle Rio Grande Valley and these resources provide a critical landscape in the life cycle of many birds.</p> <p>We are particularly concerned that the proposed crossing of the SunZia Transmission Line just north of the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge will have an undue and avoidable impact on the rich wildlife resources of the Rio Grande Valley. Any crossing of the Rio Grande will entail significant impacts to migrating bird populations and other wildlife. The route crossing at Highway 380 just north of Bosque del Apache is particularly egregious in its effect on the Rocky Mountain population of Sandhill Cranes.</p>	Sangre de Cristo Audubon Society
<b>CODE 031.13 Tucson (Avoid/Concerns for Area)</b>		
909	<p>I am a conservation land owner in the San Pedro River Valley. The cultural, environmental and eco-economic resources of the San Pedro far outweigh any value 2 500kV lines might provide the area, or state. Irreplaceable archeology would be lost.</p> <p>Urban routes should be moved to the top of the list for consideration.</p> <p>1.) construction in already disturbed/environmentally comprised areas. 2.) bring power to power users.</p>	
914	<p>I know this project will have a lot of "Not in my backyard!" reaction. However, as a Tucson resident, I would rather have a pylon actually in my backyard than anywhere in the San Pedro River Valley. Why San Pedro would even be considered is beyond me – one of the last undammed rivers, with only a small dirt road going through some of the last undamaged desert areas is the Southwest. It is especially confusing when the already damaged I-10 corridor goes to the exact place the lines are trying to reach. I am so glad that Tucson route is now being considered! I understand there are difficulties with land ownership and the like, but the damage to pretty much any site in Tucson is already done: power lines through the San Pedro Valley would cause damage that potentially would not be healed in our lifetimes, if ever. When you talk about putting the lines through Tucson and meet resistance, PLEASE tell those people about the area you are preserving.</p>	
921	<p>Thank you very much for opening up the scoping process and for adding Tucson routes into the project area as potential routes.</p> <p>I would urge you to seriously consider running such a transmission line through Tucson rather than the San Pedro River Valley. The San Pedro</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	is a fragile and irreplaceable archeological landscape in the valley. A powerline would cause both direct and indirect effects on those features. Tucson's cultural sites and ecosystem are already fragmented. If there must be a line, put it through Tucson.	
932	I want a route that utilizes existing utility corridors. It is important that we preserve our natural and cultural resources – this means not route through the San Pedro Valley. I want you to think "outside" the box – there are existing routes through Tucson and also along the Route 40.	
933	<p>I am opposed to the proposed transmission routes that go through the San Pedro River Valley. This area is the last undammed river in Arizona and an important migratory corridor for birds native to the western United States. The roads that will be added along with the power lines will have severe ecological effects on the wildlife in the region. The additional development will negatively change the flow of water and disrupt the habitats of numerous endangered species.</p> <p>I much prefer the new routes that pass by I-10/Tucson and appreciate the efforts of BLM to incorporate the opinion of the community in developing these routes. The newly proposed corridors will have less impact on the surrounding environment without putting an undue burden on the engineering of the project.</p>	
938	<p>Under no circumstances should any SunZia lines pass through the San Pedro Watershed! The San Pedro Watershed shelters numbers of birds, fish, mammals, and other species virtually unparalleled in the United States.</p> <p>I will be providing more extensive and scientifically documented comments in May, but priority of this and all new transmission projects should be given to routes following I-10 or through other disturbed areas. The route following the Rillito and Pantano washes east and north through Tucson seems especially promising.</p>	
950	I oppose the proposed routes through the San Pedro River Valley. The San Pedro is a national treasure that must not be the location of this project. As one of the last undammed rivers and home to hundreds of species of wildlife, the proposed routes would further threaten this jewel of an area. Instead, I urge support of the route along existing rights-of-way near to Tucson where I live.	
1047	Saguaro National Park (SNP) is comprised of two disjunct units (Rincon Mountain District and Tucson Mountain District) located immediately east and west of the city of Tucson. According to the current updated project area map that you discussed in the April 2 meeting, both districts of the park are within the Study Area for the proposed transmission line routes. Our comments and concerns are related to direct and indirect potential impacts to park values. The mandate of the National Park Service is to preserve and protect the scenery, and natural and cultural resources of park lands for the enjoyment of the American public, and to leave them unimpaired to be enjoyed by future generations (16 USC 1-4). The "scenery," includes the natural viewshed, as well as the landscape. The scenery of a national park, like air, water or wildlife, is a valuable resource that can easily be degraded or destroyed by	National Park Service – Saguaro

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>surrounding development.</p> <p>In addition, both districts of the park contain substantial designated Wilderness areas, comprising over 78% of the park's total acreage. According to the Wilderness Act, areas with this designation must be managed in their primitive condition, where "the impact of man's work [is] substantially unnoticeable." Location of the transmission lines adjacent to either unit of the park would have significant negative impacts to both the park's viewshed and its Wilderness Character.</p> <p>We support either the No Action alternative, or location of the transmission lines well north of the city of Tucson, bypassing the city altogether.</p>	
1081	<p>PLEASE! If this project is really proposing to support the major energy markets, then it should work with the major energy market in the region it passes through. Routing through Tucson and more coordination with Tucson Power Electric Company will allow more local access to power in these lines and make much more efficient use of existing infrastructure corridors. It will avoid permanent damage to wilderness areas in the Galiuro Mountains and the riparian ecology of the San Pedro River.</p>	
1084	<p>There are significant opportunities to meet the goals of both organizations such as TEP infrastructure improvement projects in Tucson and SunZia's stated goal to minimize ecological damage along their path from energy source to destination. Missing these opportunities will neglect our region's needs. This could be achieved by co-locating lines desired by both organizations and by following a route that minimizes impacts in the city, such as the route proposed by the Cascabel Working Group.</p>	
1110	<p>Use Existing Information to Identify and Remove Routes with Known Impacts to Significant Cultural Resources</p> <p>We appreciate BLM's identification of cultural resource priority areas based on information we and others have submitted. Unfortunately we are unable to discern how this information has influenced the design or consideration of proposed alignments. In particular, we draw your attention to the following line segments: C170, C400, C420, C430, C440, C443, C450, C460, C530, C540, C590, C790, F450, F461, F470, and F440. These routes, in particular, traverse cultural resource priority areas that have already been identified by CDA and despite the information provided no removal or re-alignment of these linkages has occurred since the beginning of the scoping process.</p> <p>Recommendation: Remove line segments C170, C400, C420, C430, C440, C443, C450, C460, C530, C540, C590, C790, F450, F461, F470, and F440 from further project consideration.</p>	Center for Desert Archaeology; National Trust for Historic Preservation
1121	<p>The [attached] report begins with a summary that includes (1) a proposal for a more viable Tucson route, (2) recommended technologies to reduce the environmental and social impact of the project, (3) negotiations required with specific entities to use the alternative route, and (4) how this route and project could benefit Tucson and southern Arizona.</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>Route Suggestions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– In entering Tucson from the east, the SunZia Project crosses the Cienega Creek Natural Preserve and passes through the Vail community, a very sensitive area. An alternative route is suggested south of I-10 that bypasses this area, significantly reducing impact without appreciably affecting the project’s length or cost.</li> <li>– An alternative route is suggested to reach the Pantano Wash–Rillito River corridor from I-10 that parallels Houghton Road west of Vail, again eliminating the impact on Vail and providing a physically easier path for the project to reach the Pantano Wash. Although we do not advocate a Pantano Wash–Rillito River route, we nevertheless offer this suggestion.</li> <li>– An alternative route to reach the Santa Cruz River corridor is proposed that greatly reduces the impact upon residential and business areas and removes the project from the vicinity of the Davis-Monthan Air force Base, which undoubtedly will not permit the project to pass as close to the base as currently proposed. In addition, none of the subroutes that SunZia proposes to reach the Santa Cruz River – the principal corridor needed to pass through the city – appears physically feasible because of insufficient space, and the suggested alternative resolves this problem.</li> </ul> <p><b>REPORT SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A CENTRAL TUCSON SUNZIA ROUTE</b></p> <p><b>I. Route Recommendation</b></p> <p>The most probable central Tucson route for the SunZia Project is down the Santa Cruz River corridor. However difficult this route will be, it appears significantly more plausible than following the Pantano Wash–Rillito River corridor, the other physically realistic route to consider.</p> <p>SunZia has proposed three routes to reach the Santa Cruz River, none of them truly physically possible: (1) north side I-10 (Union Pacific Railroad/Aviation Highway corridor), (2) south side I-10 (includes Benson Highway corridor), and (3) Drexel Road (proposed to reach Avra Valley but crosses the Santa Cruz River). The new route recommendation is as follows (Figure 1):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Proceed due west from the Vail substation, following Tucson Electric Power Company’s 138-kV line along the East Old Vail Connection Road to the eastern boundary of the San Xavier District of the Tohono O’odham Nation.</li> <li>– The route must then cross the northeast corner of the District to reach the Santa Cruz River, either on the east or west side of Martinez Hill. This could be a difficult negotiation with the Tohono O’odham Nation.</li> <li>– The route then proceeds northward up the Santa Cruz River for 2–3 miles until it again encounters TEP’s 138-kV line, which runs within the Santa Cruz River corridor northward. The route will then follow this line until it encounters SunZia’s proposed route.</li> </ul> <p>Advantages of this route are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– This route contains more than adequate space to hold the project’s lines. SunZia’s proposed routes do not.</li> </ul>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>– Right-of-way will be much more easily obtained, and land negotiations will far less numerous and complex.</p> <p>– The route reduces the cultural features encountered by orders of magnitude (residential and business areas in particular).</p> <p>This route will encounter strong opposition from several entities, enumerated in Negotiations Required below. These entities may not consent to having the project cross the lands they oversee, but it is important to approach them before abandoning a Tucson route for the project.</p>	
1156	<p>I still favor the more expensive route, that is, more expensive to the SunZia group, of Winchester to Vail through Tucson via steel towers instead of lattice towers. This right-of-way can be accomplished in a way that will make more “sense.” I also want to say that I do not believe that the DOD and Ft. Huachuca are intensely against this route.</p>	
1169	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The City of Tucson (City) is engaged in a long-term economic development and revitalization process for the Tucson Downtown. This effort is often referred to as Rio Nuevo. Siting of transmission lines could have a detrimental impact on this effort if they reduced the look and feel of the Downtown area. Rejuvenation of the Downtown is extremely important to the economic vitality of the entire region. Factors such as aesthetics play a critical role in the success of such efforts.</li> <li>• The City has a long-standing commitment to the preservation of sensitive environmental resources including watercourses and associated riparian habitat, and habitat for vulnerable wildlife and plant species. Lands within the City, particularly those south of Interstate 10, and lands owned by the City of Tucson in Avra Valley, west of the Tucson Mountains, provide habitat for several endangered, threatened, and candidate species. Both areas are shown as potential locations for transmission lines. The City has been involved in the development of Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs) under Section 10 of the Endangered Species Act for these two areas. Those plans are available for your review and we request that they be considered in the development of the SunZia Project EIS. The City also recognizes the significant value provided by riparian habitat and has regulated impacts to watercourses for more than 20 years. Major watercourses such as the Santa Cruz, Rillito, and Pantano are especially important and the City, Pima County, the Town of Marana, and Army Corps of Engineers have invested millions of dollars in developing restoration plans for portions of these watercourses. These restoration plans, and the City's overall goal of minimizing impacts to riparian habitat, should also be taken into consideration.</li> <li>• The City owned lands in Avra Valley are the site for both existing and proposed water supply facilities. Current facilities include recharge basins and recovery wells. Water supply is a major concern for the region and it is important that land uses adjacent to these lands not impair the function of existing facilities or the ability of the City to develop additional facilities.</li> <li>• Many residents in the Midtown region of the City have had a long-standing concern with the impact of growth and changes in land use on</li> </ul>	City of Tucson

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>quality of life. Issues such as air traffic, road congestion, and interface between residential areas and nonresidential uses have been significant topics of discussion. Any transmission lines alignments that run through the City proper will need to be considered in an open and transparent dialogue with the residents that would be impacted.</p> <p>Regardless of the route chosen, the City requests that BLM take every opportunity to engage the residents, businesses, agencies, and stakeholder groups of this community. We support the overall goal of bring renewably-generated energy to areas currently served by carbon-intensive energy supplies, but the development of this project will be a success only if it respects and compliments our local goals for environmental preservation, quality of life, economic development, and sense of place.</p>	
1200	<p>To the stakeholders of the SunZIA project:</p> <p>1. I urge your group to recommend the Tucson Corridor for the Sun Zia high power transmission lines.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <p>a. The Tucson Corridor is already is use and further carrying capacity is in progress being paid for by TEP. SunZIA could join in and share expenses and profits in further developing already disturbed areas.</p>	
1223	<p>Attached please find a Resolution of the Board of Directors for Friends of Saguaro National Park, expressing their opposition to any proposed SunZia power corridor route through the Avra Valley, near Tucson, AZ.</p> <p>While the Board certainly understands and appreciates the desirability of developing and transmitting renewable energy, they believe that any route through the Avra Valley would negatively impact the Tucson Mountain District of Saguaro National Park. The Board concurs with the opinions expressed by Saguaro National Park Superintendent Darla Sidles in her letter to you dated April 16, 2010. Specifically, we would agree with her recommendation of either the No Action alternative, or location of the transmission lines well north of Tucson – bypassing the city altogether.</p>	Friends of Saguaro National Park
1231	<p>If SunZia wishes to pass through southern Arizona, they need to effectively collaborate with the urban center in our region. If they cannot find a route that does not fragment and significantly damage the dwindling ecological reserves of our region, then they need to look toward another development corridor for their project. Thus, SunZia needs to go back to the drawing board in Tucson, and this time, collaborate effectively with the stakeholders in the process of developing possible routes.</p>	
1244	<p>I am writing to voice my opposition to SunZia’s proposed transmission routes through Arizona’s wilderness areas, including the Aravaipa and the San Pedro. Our state’s wilderness areas should not be sacrificed in order to provide an energy source for other states. The SunZia plan appears to have very little benefit for Arizona residents: only 14% of the total energy transmission rights from these lines will serve our state. Meanwhile, we will be the ones who bear the environmental consequences of this project, while private investors and residents of</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>other states are the ones who will profit most. While I appreciate the conservation value of renewable energy, delivering it at the expense of a fragile environment is irresponsible. There are routes through Tucson using existing infrastructure corridors which would have far less impact on the environment. If this project is to go forward, the obvious solution is for SunZia to work with local Arizona power companies and route the transmission lines accordingly, with as little disruption to the environment as possible.</p>	
1245	<p>The plans of SunZia Transmission LLC to construct and operate up to two 500 kilovolt transmission lines originating in Socorro or Lincoln County, New Mexico and going west for approximately 460 miles to Pinal County, Arizona should take into consideration the County and City designated growth areas and private lands approved for development. The Pima Association of Governments has a 2040 Regional Transportation Roadway Plan which should be used as a basis for alignments through the Tucson basin. To the greatest extent possible, the alignment should run through public lands within the Tucson metropolitan area. Such alignment should run primarily through State Trust lands south of 1-10 within Pima County, and make every effort to avoid private property.</p>	Diamond Ventures, Inc.
1313	<p>It has come to my attention that a potential routing alignment for a SunZia transmission line is in consideration which would dissect our 4600 acre Master Planned Community Willow Springs. For obvious reasons we would be opposed to this location because we feel that the aesthetical impact would significantly diminish the future value of our project.</p>	Lennar Corporation-Tucson Land Division
1381	<p><b>Tucson Routes</b></p> <p>The least environmentally harmful routes would include the proposed Tucson routes or possibly other Tucson routes not yet considered, including a route submitted by the Cascabel Working Group (CWG), dated May 28, 2010. To the greatest degree possible, these routes should follow existing transportation or transmission corridors in order to limit additional fragmentation of wildlife habitat and wildlife travel corridors.</p> <p>We ask that the BLM give serious consideration to routes that meet these criteria, including the route presented by the CWG. The CWG proposed route, while not free of potential conflicts, would avoid many of the potential conflicts and seemingly insurmountable obstacles presented by the other Tucson routes identified by the BLM. A Tucson route could provide opportunity to improve the grid in and around Tucson and is also an opportunity for co-location of projects with Tucson Electric Power.</p>	Sierra Club et. al.
<b>CODE 031.14 Pantano Wash (Avoid/Concerns for Area)</b>		
938	<p>Under no circumstances should any SunZia lines pass through the San Pedro Watershed!</p> <p>The route following the Rillito and Pantano washes east and north through Tucson seems especially promising.</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1058	<p>We anticipate that the Pantano Wash-Rillito River route would have appreciable impacts to aquatic, mesoriparian, and xeroriparian resources in the named streams. The Cienega Creek/Pantano Wash stream channel is critical habitat for the federally endangered Gila chub (<i>Gila intermedia</i>), and individuals of the species occur upstream. Endangered Gila topminnow have been documented at a diversion near where Pantano Wash enters the far eastern portions of Tucson. The federally endangered Huachuca water umbel (<i>Lilaeopsis schaffleriana</i> var. <i>recurva</i>) occurs upstream in Cienega Creek; the species could also persist in the perennial, shallow-water conditions at the diversion.</p> <p>We have documented the presence of a roost site for endangered lesser long-nosed bats in the foothills of the Santa Catalina Mountains, north of the Rillito River, and limited telemetry data appear to illustrate that the species uses the stream courses in question as routes to access hummingbird feeders in the Tucson metropolitan area during years of reduced saguaro cactus blossom availability.</p>	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1169	<p>The City also recognizes the significant value provided by riparian habitat and has regulated impacts to watercourses for more than 20 years. Major watercourses such as the Santa Cruz, Rillito, and Pantano are especially important and the City, Pima County, the Town of Marana, and Army Corps of Engineers have invested millions of dollars in developing restoration plans for portions of these watercourses. These restoration plans, and the City's overall goal of minimizing impacts to riparian habitat, should also be taken into consideration.</p>	City of Tucson
<b>CODE 031.15 Davis Monthan/AANG/Airport (Avoid/Concerns for Area)</b>		
1121	<p>Route Suggestions [Through Tucson]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– In entering Tucson from the east, the SunZia Project crosses the Cienega Creek Natural Preserve and passes through the Vail community, a very sensitive area. An alternative route is suggested south of I-10 that bypasses this area, significantly reducing impact without appreciably affecting the project's length or cost.</li> <li>– An alternative route is suggested to reach the Pantano Wash–Rillito River corridor from I-10 that parallels Houghton Road west of Vail, again eliminating the impact on Vail and providing a physically easier path for the project to reach the Pantano Wash. Although we do not advocate a Pantano Wash–Rillito River route, we nevertheless offer this suggestion.</li> <li>– An alternative route to reach the Santa Cruz River corridor is proposed that greatly reduces the impact upon residential and business areas and removes the project from the vicinity of the Davis-Monthan Air force Base, which undoubtedly will not permit the project to pass as close to the base as currently proposed. In addition, none of the subroutes that SunZia proposes to reach the Santa Cruz River – the principal corridor needed to pass through the city – appears physically feasible because of insufficient space, and the suggested alternative resolves this problem.</li> </ul> <p>Santa Cruz River Corridor The SunZia Project attempts to reach the Santa Cruz River corridor via</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>two principal routes that roughly parallel both the north and south sides of I-10 (Figure 4). Both potentially conflict with Davis-Monthan flight patterns. The route north of I-10 follows the Union Pacific Railroad corridor into Tucson, and the route on the south eventually intersections the Benson Highway corridor. Once the Benson Highway corridor is reached, two potential routes could be used to reach the Santa Cruz, one that closely parallels I-10 and a second (not actually proposed for this purpose) that follows a TEP 138-kV corridor along Drexel Road that SunZia would use as a possible route to Avra Valley.</p> <p>Union Pacific Railroad/Aviation Highway Corridor</p> <p>The route on the north side of I-10 (F70) follows the Union Pacific Railroad corridor from Vail into the city, passing along the south and west side of Davis-Monthan Air Force Base and then following the Aviation Highway into downtown Tucson. It is difficult to continue the route past the termination of the Aviation Highway at Broadway Boulevard just east of downtown Tucson, from which point it must follow the much narrower Union Pacific Railroad corridor. The route cannot reach the Santa Cruz River corridor without leaving the railroad corridor and passing directly over the top of a residential neighborhood (Figure 5). This route is thus not feasible for several reasons. First, the project borders Davis-Monthan Air Force Base directly on the south, and the Department of Defense would not permit SunZia transmission lines this close to D-M’s runways.</p>	
1366	<p>The compromised airspace resulting from the subject project would have a potentially devastating effect on the regional economy and quality of life. TAA is responsible for ensuring Federal Regulation 49 CFR Part 77 and FAA Terminal Instrument Procedure requirements are maintained. These regulations are intended to protect the long-term viability of safe aviation activity in the region by standardizing minimum standards for unobstructed approach and departure surfaces. Although there are numerous standards applicable to the subject project, the required 10,000-foot conical surface surrounding both airports required by Part 77 captures the majority of the design criteria and obstruction prevention goals as they relate to the subject. In the absence of more detailed information on specific structure heights, elevations of project routes, or detailed alignments of project routes; no route should be located within this 10,000-foot buffer area (as measured from the runway ends of each airport). The attached map shows this area in geographical detail. TAA opposes the location of any project route within 10,000 feet of an existing or planned TUS or RYN runway end. TAA's opposition may be reviewed, and potentially modified, if additional information is provided as discussed above.</p>	Tucson Airport Authority
1367	<p>I understand the project includes the construction of multiple 500kv poles in the vicinity of Tucson International Airport and Ryan Airfield. I’m concerned that federal aviation law (ie Part 77 surfaces) has not been considered. Please be advised that local airport zoning is less restrictive than federal law and therefore is not a viable proxy for understanding and/or addressing federal airspace standards. Moreover, airport management and airspace protection is the responsibility of Tucson</p>	Tucson Airport Authority

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	Airport Authority.	
<b>CODE 031.16 Avra Valley (Avoid/Concerns for Area)</b>		
906	The Avra Valley is chock full of archeological sites, many of them unique, and wildlife. The Tucson Mitigation Corridor, Saguaro National Park, and Tucson Mountain Park would be severely impacted by the Avra Valley Routes.	
916	Do not go through the Avra Valley, Saguaro National Park, and Tucson Mountain Park. This is a unique possession for Arizona which cannot be destroyed. It is my understanding that not only is this area a protected migratory route, but also a high lightening impact area – a really great area for metal poles. This area brings in tourism dollars that we desperately need, this will drive those dollars away. Please reconsider and eliminate any route near these irreplaceable resources.	
920	While it is necessary to have powerlines to transmit electricity from any source, including renewable energy, I must express my concern over any route that follows the CAP canal or that bisects or skirts the Tucson Mitigation Corridor. There is already too much going on in the Avra Valley that negatively impacts the ability of wildlife to cross from the Tucson Mtns to the mountain ranges further west, specifically the CAP canal and CAP recharge ponds. Besides the sensitivity regarding wildlife migration, there is the concern over the damage to the landscape (both visual as well as physical.) There are too many beautiful parks in the Avra Valley that would suffer from the construction of a 1000-ft corridor ad all the huge, unsightly towers. Why not construct more substations using smaller lines, or using existing corridors?	
931	Re: segments F100, F104, F350, F410, F400, F360, F330, F340, F420, F430, F450, F440 F432  I object to the siting of any proposed transmission lines relating to the Sunzia Southwest Project through the 13 above-listed areas. I live in the area that would be impacted. It is the most ecologically unique and rare saguaro forest in the world. There is no sane or rational reason that I can imagine that would warrant siting such a project in this sensitive area. Existing infrastructure on the east side the Tucson Mountains makes much more sense as a location for the lines (along the I-10 corridor.) Low income and elderly and Native populations would be disproportionately impacted if the project was sited along the above-listed segments.	
954	My wife and I are very concerned that the transmission line will be pushed through because \$\$\$ talk. Talking of which, to destroy the beauty of the Sonoran Desert in this region is a sacrilege. Desert Museum, Tucson Studios, Saguaro National Park, Tucson Mountain Park are just a few of the things that make this area special and the choice of millions of visitors per year. Not to see power lines.	
956	I live in the Avra Valley and operate a vacation rental on 10 acres of beautiful desert. I have heard that there are plans to put a power line up the Avra Valley. This is a very troubling proposal and I am totally	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>opposed to it. Not only would it be a major disruption to our views, but it would have a damaging impact on my rental property business. Guests constantly remark on the sunset views to the west, the sunrise over the Tucson Mountains and the general sense of quiet beauty on the western slopes of the Tucson Mountains. The Arizona Sonora Desert Museum is located here for a reason – the unspoiled beauty of this area. Please do not destroy this unique desert habitat Use existing routes for power transmission, don't spoil more desert.</p>	
1047	<p>In addition to these potential visitor experience and wilderness impacts, we are concerned about the impacts to local natural resources, particularly the wildlife habitat loss and fragmentation that occurs from such a large linear development. Insularization of the park from other protected natural areas is a crucial management issue for wildlife. Both districts of the park are increasingly surrounded by urbanization and development. The San Pedro River Valley, on the east side of the Rincon Mountain District of the Park, is an important wildlife corridor and link to other protected natural areas such as the Galiuro and Redfield Canyon Wilderness Areas. Saguaro National Park receives over 700,000 visitors to the park each year from all over the world, generating over \$23 million in visitor spending. In combination with the Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum and Pima County's Tucson Mountain Park west of Interstate 10, millions of visitors and citizens rely on these areas for rest, recreation, solace, and education about our unique Sonoran Desert resources. We cannot afford to alter this landscape.</p> <p>We respectfully request that the potential corridors shown west of the park's west boundary, as well as the potential San Pedro River Valley corridor east of the park's east boundary, be removed from consideration.</p>	National Park Service – Saguaro
1052	<p>In response to your April 2010 Project Update, and expansion of the SunZia Project study area, I am providing comments specific to the Avra Valley corridor. This memorandum supplements my earlier written comments dated February 25, 2010, on the SunZia Project. The Bureau of Reclamation recognizes and supports the need for renewable energy sources.</p> <p>I appreciated the opportunity for Mr. Bruce Ellis of my staff to meet with you and the project proponent and consultants on April 2 in Tucson. However, the Avra Valley route that was discussed in that meeting would bisect Central Arizona Project's (CAP) Tucson Mitigation Corridor, which serves as a preserve for wildlife and plants and provides an undeveloped corridor for large mammals to move between the Tucson Mountains to the east and the Roskrige Mountains to the west. Reclamation acquired the 4.25-square-mile corridor as partial mitigation for biological impacts resulting from construction and operation of the CAP Tucson Aqueduct. Reclamation signed a cooperative agreement with the Arizona Game and Fish Department and the Pima County Parks and Recreation Department for the management of these lands, including agreement to oppose any further development within the corridor. Reclamation has consistently opposed, and continues to oppose, use of the corridor for any use that could adversely affect plants, wildlife, and wildlife movement for which the corridor was</p>	Bureau of Reclamation

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>established.</p> <p>I would also point out that visual impacts from sensitive viewing areas such as the Arizona Sonora Desert Museum were a major issue during planning for the CAP Aqueduct in this area. The Tucson Mitigation Corridor, by preserving these 4.25 square miles of land from future development, helped to mitigate these impacts as well. Based on commitments we have made to prohibit future development within this mitigation corridor, we cannot support the Avra Valley route and do not believe it is a reasonable alternative that should be considered in the Environmental Impact Statement for the SunZia Project.</p>	
1058	<p>The potential routes that run south and west of Tucson may affect the federally endangered Pima pineapple cactus (<i>Coryphantha scheeri</i> var. <i>robustispina</i>) and, in areas containing saguaro cactus, lesser long-nosed bats. In areas west of Tucson within the western bajadas of the Tucson Mountains and in the vicinity of the Central Arizona Project Canal, we have concerns over the interruption of wildlife corridors that link the mountain ranges east and west of the Avra Valley. Please note the Service must coordinate with tribes, pursuant to Secretarial Order 3206. Any route crossing lands of the San Xavier District and/or other lands of the Tohono O'odham Nation will warrant consultation between the Service, other Department of the Interior agencies, and affected tribes.</p>	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1169	<p>The City owned lands in Avra Valley are the site for both existing and proposed water supply facilities. Current facilities include recharge basins and recovery wells. Water supply is a major concern for the region and it is important that land uses adjacent to these lands not impair the function of existing facilities or the ability of the City to develop additional facilities.</p>	City of Tucson
1223	<p>Attached please find a Resolution of the Board of Directors for Friends of Saguaro National Park, expressing their opposition to any proposed SunZia power corridor route through the Avra Valley, near Tucson, AZ.</p> <p>While the Board certainly understands and appreciates the desirability of developing and transmitting renewable energy, they believe that any route through the Avra Valley would negatively impact the Tucson Mountain District of Saguaro National Park. The Board concurs with the opinions expressed by Saguaro National Park Superintendent Darla Sidles in her letter to you dated April 16, 2010. Specifically, we would agree with her recommendation of either the No Action alternative, or location of the transmission lines well north of Tucson – bypassing the city altogether.</p>	Friends of Saguaro National Park
1275	<p>Potential Conflicts With Landholders and Land-Use Patterns Along the Western Route</p> <p>The portions of this western route that would require more negotiations, it appears, would be along Sahuarita Road where it would border residential (although lower-density) areas; near Sahuarita where the route must cross the Santa Cruz River and 1-10; the section along South Sandario Road between the San Xavier District of the Tohono O'odham Nation and the Central Arizona Project; and the section near Marana where the CAP passes beneath 1-10.</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>The cross-country section between Sahuarita Road and Sahuarita traverses the "Southlands," an area that has been well studied as part of Pima County's comprehensive Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan. The project may encounter some conflict here even though the route does not disturb human settlements. Near Sahuarita, SunZia's route would cross agricultural lands on the east side of I-19, while on the west side it would bisect a low-density subdivision. Moving the route north or south to an existing corridor would avoid this latter conflict, however.</p> <p>The new segment along South Sandario Road in Avra Valley would border or traverse agricultural land and low-density housing in places, and near Marana the route would cross agricultural lands. The greatest conflict with private land owners and housing would occur along South Sandario Road north of Ajo Way (Highway 86). Most of this conflict could be avoided if the route turned east at Ajo Way (coming from the south) and followed the south side of Ajo Way to the southern terminus of the Central Arizona Project, which is just north of the highway. Here a lower-voltage power line crosses Ajo Way to reach the CAP. This alternative route would be 4+ miles longer, however.</p> <p>Another concern in Avra Valley would be the route's close approach to Saguaro National Park and Tucson Mountain Park. Past development projects have been strongly opposed because of their potential impact on these parks. The route would also cross the Bureau of Reclamation's Wildlife Mitigation Corridor, which was established as a concession to complete the Central Arizona Project. It is uncertain whether the line would concern the Tohono O'odham people of the Nation's San Xavier District. A TEP 345-kV line currently follows the district's boundary around its southwestern corner for approximately four miles. This line detours around the district even though a previous lower-voltage power line crosses it, indicating that the Tohono O'odham did not want the newer line on their land.</p> <p>Conclusions</p> <p>Overall this westward route appears to present far fewer obstacles than a central Tucson route. It is much more open and could accommodate two transmission lines much more easily. Conflict with cultural features and land ownership would be greatly reduced as well. The route would be somewhat longer, but this would be offset, at least partly, by fewer right-of-way issues and lower legal costs.</p>	
1290	<p>The 10,000 residents of the community of Picture Rocks, more in Avra Valley, and certainly lots of people in some Tucson neighborhoods, would be highly impacted by proposed power line routes. Most of those have not really had a chance to hear any discussion or details or to participate in any open and transparent public input forums.</p>	
1305	<p>We are residents of the Avra Valley and we do not want 500 kilovolt power lines near our homes, schools and community. We want the integrity of the Tucson Mitigation Corridor, set up to protect wildlife, to remain intact. We do not want our parks and communities at risk of noise and visual pollution. Use the existing I-10 corridor.</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1317	<p>I attended the scoping meeting and became convinced that the SunZia SW project is a very bad idea to go through the Avra Valley/Picture Rocks area. Arizona must protect its unique environment. It is why so many tourist dollars come to this area, once it is gone, so are those dollars. It is also an approved Migratory Corridor which is as important as the San Pedro River Valley. It is my understanding that this has already been designated a protected area which cannot be destroyed for reasons like the SunZia.</p>	
1396	<p><b>Avra Valley Routes</b></p> <p>Both Tucson Mountain Park (TMP) and the Tucson Mitigation Corridor (TMC) are part of the Pima County Conservation Lands System. The SDCP identified priority vulnerable species, cultural resources, special management areas and critical linkages that may be impacted by the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project. The project proponents are advised to consider the wealth of information available from the SDCP. There are several Pima County Code issues to consider. Sandario, Mile Wide, Kinney, and Gates Pass Roads are designated Major Scenic Routes by the Pima County Zoning Code and have views of the proposed SunZia project. The intent of this designation is to preserve and enhance the visual resources of the natural and built environment. SunZia routes within one mile of TMP are also in the Pima County Buffer Overlay Zone. One purpose of the Buffer Overlay Zone is to foster wildlife habitat in the vicinity of Pima County's public preserves. Finally, much of the private land adjacent to TMP and the TMC is included in the Resource Transition land use category of the Pima County Comprehensive Plan, and development of such lands are to blend with the natural landscape and support environmentally sensitive linkages.</p> <p>In 2008, Pima County completed a Management Plan for TMP that addresses the Tucson Mitigation Corridor; lease properties such as the Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum (ASDM); and visual, biological, and cultural resource management. Management of the Tucson Mitigation Corridor is governed by a cooperative agreement between Pima County, Arizona Game and Fish Department and the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bureau acquired the TMC as partial mitigation for the Central Arizona Project, and in the Bureau's April 26, 2010 correspondence to ELM, they clearly oppose use of the TMC for the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project.</p> <p>According to the TMP Management Plan, 1.4 million people visit the park on an annual basis not including drive through commuters. 870,000, or 62 percent, visit the world renowned ASDM, Gates Pass Overlook and the other park pull outs. ASDM, Gates Pass Overlook and many of the park roads and trails incorporate a view to the west of the same iconic Sonoran Desert landscape proposed for the construction of potentially two 190-foot high, 500kv transmission lines by SunZia. Negative visual impacts associated with this project may result in negative impacts to the multimillion dollar tourist industry of southern Arizona.</p> <p>In their April 16, 2010 letter to ELM, Saguaro National Park refers to wildlife habitat loss and fragmentation as one of the reasons they oppose</p>	Pima County (AZ)

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>SunZia routes adjacent to Saguaro National Park. Pima County is committed to the expansion of biological connections between TMP and other natural resource areas. A proposed 1,000-foot wide right of way for the SunZia Southwest Transmission project will compromise the intent of the existing TMC biological connection to Saguaro National Park, the Brawley/Black Wash Complex and the mountain ranges of the Ironwood Forest National Monument to the west.</p> <p>The Pima County Board of Supervisors adopted resolutions in opposition to similar past projects, notably the 2000 Public Service Company of New Mexico (PNM) Sonora – Arizona Interconnection Project and the 2007 Arizona Department of Transportation Interstate 10 Bypass. In addition, a 2007 TEP utility corridor proposal was opposed by Pima County. Pima County has a strong and consistent track record of opposing utility and transportation corridors that impact, are adjacent to or bisect TMP. Should the SunZia Southwest Transmission project continue proposing the Avra Valley Routes noted above, similar opposition can be anticipated.</p>	
<b>CODE 031.17 Indian Reservation (AZ) (Avoid/Concerns for Area)</b>		
907	<p>The southern route parallel to I-10 is the only route that is feasible to concerned public. Consideration to crossing should be to the Tohono O’odham lands and even going only across or west of the Ironwood monument. The Indians (who are under the Dept. of Interior) I certain would be amicable to leasing a right-of-way. This would probably bring in more money to them than two casinos – at no expense to them.</p>	
1121	<p>To be feasible, the alternative route proposed through the city will require very careful and potentially difficult negotiations with the Tohono O’odham Nation, the city of Tucson, and Pima County, each of whom is likely to object strongly to it, at least initially. In addition, the Army Corp of Engineers, which oversees the Santa Cruz River corridor, will have stringent rules for using it, which could complicate securing its use.</p> <p>Proposed Alternative Route for Reaching the Santa Cruz River</p> <p>This alternative route would continue roughly west from this point until it encountered the Old Nogales Highway, which borders the east side of the San Xavier District of the Tohono O’odham Nation.</p> <p>While the Tohono O’odham Nation would very possibly not permit the crossing of the San Xavier District, this route is physically possible whereas SunZia’s other routes are not, and it is a route to investigate.</p>	
<b>CODE 031.18 Belen (Avoid/Concerns for Area)</b>		
884	<p>I do not believe the new proposals address the issues of a river crossing between Bosque del Apache and Belen. Any crossing must be underground to preserve the integrity of the daily flight paths of sandhill cranes and migratory routes for other birds. Routes adjacent to Belen still mar the landscape/viewscape as they come past Socorro and San Antonio. Any new lines between San Antonio and Belen will damage our already struggling farmers and our ecotourisms bas that is inherently</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	tied to our open spaces and beautiful scenery. The only acceptable routes remain those that run along the borders of White Sands and cross the river south of the Bosque del Apache.	
1037	The Study Expansion route north to Belen is also a poor choice. The route goes through the Ladron Peak Wilderness Area vicinity and unnecessarily swings out of line to Belen. My strong vote goes for following 1-10 and 1-25 corridors as much as possible.	
1250	Sue Moran, Administrator for the Tierra Grande Improvement Association, Inc. attended the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project Public Scoping Meeting in Socorro, NM on April 27, 2010. It was brought to her attention that two (2) of the proposed transmission line routes (N20 – N30) could impact our community. Tierra Grande Improvement Association is a rural residential development split between Valencia and Socorro County. We currently have over 140 homes in the area. It is bordered on the south by the Sevilleta National Wildlife Refuge and on the east by the Manzano Mountains/Cibola National Forest. Highway 47 runs north & south through the middle of the development and Highway 60 runs east and west in southern portion. Our residents enjoy beautiful mountain views, star filled night skies, and unobstructed vistas.	Tierra Grande Improvement Association
1338	This latest round that expanded the Scoping/Study Area north to Belen, New Mexico does not adequately reduce or address the environmental impacts associated with a power and transmission line routed through the Middle Rio Grande Valley. Routes north of the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge will compromise the establishment purpose of the Bosque del Apache NWR and even the Ladd S. Gordon Waterfowl Complex managed by the New Mexico Department of Game & Fish and could significantly harm the financial investments in habitat restoration and forage for birds made by the federal and state governments.	Audubon New Mexico
<b>CODE 031.19 Sevilleta NWR (Avoid/Concerns for Area)</b>		
1008	The following resources serve as a list of impacts and reasons for the removal of the "E" lines from further consideration as well as for the proposed "A 30-40-80" lines being installed underground: Natural Environment Wildlife Migratory birds (Bosque Del Apache Refuge) Endangered and threatened wildlife (Sevilleta Refuge)	
1042	Routes with valley crossings between Socorro and Belen would pose a great hazard to the seasonal and daily flight patterns of the Sandhill Cranes and Snow Geese as well as the hundreds of thousands of birds that migrate along this route. River crossings and valley transmission lines will kill many avifauna that already suffer from reduced and threatened populations due to habitat loss and climate change relative to global warming.  The route along the eastern boundary of White Sands is the most feasible, I believe. Any route through the Sevilleta National Wildlife Refuge, the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge and the Rio Grande Corridor is absurd and completely abusive.	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1058	<p>The March 31, 2010, notice of expanded study area in New Mexico includes three additional alternative routes that are further north of the WSMR and crossing the Rio Grande in the vicinity of the Sevilleta NWR. Due to potential conflicts with migratory bird movement along the Rio Grande and Los Pinos Mountains corridors, as well as Service goals to conserve and enhance private and public lands along the Rio Grande, we remain concerned about any route that passes through Sevilleta NWR or immediately adjacent to its boundary. Furthermore, we are concerned that migratory, wintering, and nesting birds and the riparian habitat on which they rely may be affected by any crossing of the Rio Grande in Socorro or Valencia County. For example, this corridor may support nesting southwestern willow flycatchers (<i>Empidonax traillii extimus</i>), a federally listed endangered species. We believe any crossing of the historic flood plain of the Rio Grande in the vicinity of Bosque del Apache NWR and northward should be subterranean to minimize impacts to migratory birds.</p> <p>The Service believes that either of the two alternative routes provided in the October 7, 2009, expanded study area are preferable alternatives to any route that crosses the Rio Grande in the reach north of the Bosque del Apache NWR and in the vicinity of the Sevilleta NWR. The crossings of the Rio Grande in the Las Cruces area and below Caballo Reservoir are in reaches of limited riparian habitat and less bird use of the Rio Grande corridor.</p>	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1138	<p>The infrastructure for this transmission corridor will mar the landscape and be visible for many miles in the open vistas of the Middle Rio Grande Valley. Though population densities are low between Socorro and Belen, tourism and land values are tied to the unique views of the rolling hills of Sevilleta National Wildlife Refuge, the majesty of “M” Mountain, and the cottonwood gallery along the Rio Grande.</p>	
1166	<p>Concerning the proposed route for SunZia’s powerline across the northern ends of Socorro and Polvadera, I strongly urge you to reconsider the corridor proposed in SunZia’s original 2008 filing, which follows White Sand’s western fence line. I agree with the Fish and Wildlife Service that this western boundary route is the most reasonable in that it protects wildlife along the Rio Grande flyway and has the least impact on our communities.</p>	
1381	<p>Sevilleta and Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuges</p> <p>Proposed routes across (E60/E70, E120) and adjacent to (E20, E100, E110, A102, A111, A130, A140, A160)) these two National Wildlife Refuge units are unacceptable due to high levels of conflict with sensitive resources and the conservation mission and goals of the National Wildlife Refuge System:</p> <p>“The Mission of the National Wildlife Refuge System is to administer a national network of lands and waters for the conservation, management, and where appropriate, restoration of the fish, wildlife, and plant resources and their habitats within the United States for the benefit of present and future generations of Americans.” The Rio Grande River is a well-documented bird migration corridor that could be impaired by</p>	Sierra Club et. al.

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

<b>ID</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>AFFILIATION</b>
	aboveground high voltage transmission lines. The presence of transmission lines crossing this river corridor in or adjacent to these wildlife refuges present a serious conflict that would be difficult, if not impossible, to mitigate.	
1395	<p>Conservation Interests of Greatest Concern in New Mexico.</p> <p>The middle Rio Grande Valley serves as one of the most important wildlife corridors for migrating and wintering waterfowl and waterbirds in the region. The several new proposed western routes are near, and in one case adjacent to, the Sevilleta National Wildlife Refuge. The Sevilleta NWR, much like the Bosque del Apache NWR, provides critical wintering and migratory stopover habitat for migrating waterfowl, Sandhill Cranes, and other species. We recognize that this new route was proposed in response to concerns about the transmission line location relative to the Bosque del Apache NWR and about defense activity and protection of the air space near White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base. However, the migratory waterfowl, cranes, and other species in this area need unrestricted movement on a daily basis up and down the middle Rio Grande Valley to access food, water, and shelter. The siting of overhead transmission lines across or within this highly concentrated flyway, be it near either NWR or the private lands between them, could have significant negative impacts on crane and goose populations through collisions, displacement from limited suitable habitat, and disturbance of well-established migratory patterns. Therefore, The Nature Conservancy opposes any route in the vicinity of Sevilleta National Wildlife Refuge.</p>	The Nature Conservancy
1398	The proposed alternate route #1A along the Sevilleta National Wildlife Refuge and US Hwy 60 has another problem. The deed for the Sevilleta NWR has a specific reversionary clause, causing the land to revert back to the donating person or his heirs should the land use or condition be changed or altered in any way. This proposed project would clearly violate that clause, thereby causing the US Fish and Game department to lose its access and control over that important wildlife study area.	
<b>CODE 032.00 Use Existing Linear Corridor</b>		
880	As a former resident of Cascabel as well as a former preserve manager of the Muleshoe Ranch, I oppose the proposed routes for the transmission lines through the greater Cascabel area. This area is a rich Sonoran Desert ecosystem with desert tortoises, bighorn sheep, and a variety of other wildlife that would be impacted by the project. Please use existing disturbed corridors for the location of this project.	
881	SunZia lines should be kept out of the San Pedro Valley. New power transmission corridors should instead be placed along already established rail and highway corridors. The construction and maintenance of the proposed SunZia transmission lines would impact water and wildlife resources in SE Arizona, already under stress, and undermine property values and eco-tourism opportunities in the area.	
912	As several other commentators have noted, I support the development of facilities which make feasible the connection of renewable fuel-	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	generated electricity to the electric network. However, transmission lines have many adverse impacts. Thus, the proposed line should be located in areas of least environmental and cultural impact; in particular, avoid San Pedro Valley. It seems common-sensical to focus on those corridors already disturbed by transportation and industrial development specifically avoid C273, C276, C441 and other northern alignments which encroach on San Pedro Valley and focus on C260/F40 and alignments south of Tucson along I-10 and then following I-10 into Pinal County.	
915	The San Pedro River Valley is a major migration corridor for many species of birds and animals. Disturbing this area would be shameful and an insult to future generations. Following I-10 and other developed areas will have more legal issues obviously but much less environmental and political issues.	
918	I have commented to the Bureau about my opposition to using the San Pedro area as a route for this project, which has a direct negative impact on environmental, current ranching lifestyle, and animal behavior. It would seem to me that this project is better suited to use an existing thoroughfare such as I-10 than creating havoc in a pristine area.	
919	Using the existing I-10 ROW seems the most feasible and least costly of any. And yes it is unsightly – but spend money to deal with that rather than the huge expense of building roads over difficult terrain and very environmentally sensitive areas. Further, study tying into existing grids and only build what is needed. All the roads required to install and maintain the routes overland will be a wonderful draw for all the ATVers who will further tear up and degrade the landscape.	
920	While it is necessary to have powerlines to transmit electricity from any source, including renewable energy, I must express my concern over any route that follows the CAP canal or that bisects or skirts the Tucson Mitigation Corridor. There is already too much going on in the Avra Valley that negatively impacts the ability of wildlife to cross from the Tucson Mtns to the mountain ranges further west, specifically the CAP canal and CAP recharge ponds. Besides the sensitivity regarding wildlife migration, there is the concern over the damage to the landscape (both visual as well as physical.) There are too many beautiful parks in the Avra Valley that would suffer from the construction of a 1000-ft corridor ad all the huge, unsightly towers. Why not construct more substations using smaller lines, or using existing corridors?	
921	I would urge you to seriously consider running such a transmission line through Tucson rather than the San Pedro River Valley. The San Pedro is a fragile and irreplaceable archeological landscape in the valley. A powerline would cause both direct and indirect effects on those features. Tucson's cultural sites and ecosystem are already fragmented. If there must be a line, put it through Tucson.	
923	My concern would be for the habitat of all animal life as well of the utilization of roads for ATV travel and further deteriorating of the fragile environment. Once scarred this land soil will [illegible] erode and cause washing and major erosion. My suggestion – follow the current power line sources without adding anything [illegible.]	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
925	<p>I have two overarching thoughts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It makes the most sense for a new power station to be built directly between Tucson and Phoenix, not ~500 miles away. Period.</li> <li>2. If this is to be build near Albuquerque, then it should use existing corridors, (ie. I-10) not the San Pedro or Aravaipa.</li> </ol> <p>If Tucson and Phoenix need more power, they should accept the visual, psychological, and environmental consequences of that need. It's ethical.</p>	
926	<p>I think that if it was necessary to move power over a long distance (if!) then it should only be put on a route already agreed upon, such as an interstate where few people are impacted – take this up I-25 or I-40.</p>	
927	<p>RE: alternative routes proposed for the SunZia SWTP in southern Arizona should follow routes that have been already compromised by infrastructure. It is inconceivable that a route is being considered that invades two well-visited Nation Parks, ie., as in F100, F104, F350, F410, F400. Additionally, the nationally recognized Desert Museum is the (after the Grand Canyon) second most visited spot in Arizona. Its viewshed will be destroyed as will be the view from Gates Pass.</p>	
928	<p>Regarding the proposed alternate route through the Aravaipa Valley. My family has been there since 1920s. Beyond the sentimental reasons, the logic for considering this area does not exist. If we are talking impacts to a rich and diverse natural area. Other more valuable routes exist, such as the I-10 corridor. It is already an environmentally and visually disturbed area.</p>	
933	<p>I am opposed to the proposed transmission routes that go through the San Pedro River Valley. This area is the last undammed river in Arizona and an important migratory corridor for birds native to the western United States. The roads that will be added along with the power lines will have severe ecological effects on the wildlife in the region. The additional development will negatively change the flow of water and disrupt the habitats of numerous endangered species.</p> <p>I much prefer the new routes that pass by I-10/Tucson and appreciate the efforts of BLM to incorporate the opinion of the community in developing these routes. The newly proposed corridors will have less impact on the surrounding environment without putting an undue burden on the engineering of the project.</p>	
936	<p>Stay out of the San Pedro Valley! You have an existing highway system, probably one that has already been considered ugly by many standards. Use that!</p>	
943	<p>After having reviewed the information about the project presented here today, I believe it makes the most sense to choose one of the alternatives that closely follows the existing I-10 corridor and skirts Tucson to the south. This would minimize the impact on important natural resources in southern Arizona, including the San Pedro Valley and Aravaipa Valley and canyon. Constructing the transmission line through these sensitive natural areas would unnecessarily expose them to habitat degradation and future development, forever damaging them and diminishing their value as pristine refuges from the city.</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
949	<p>Power transmission lines may be necessary for future but it would be better to run power lines along existing roadways instead of ruining pristine landscapes or natural habitats and archeological interests.</p> <p>We would think the power lines should go along existing utility easements and power transmission lines at a minimum impact on the environment. The F-20 path along the railroad or F-30 along the highway seem to be most logical.</p>	
993	<p>It's unsound practice to create new corridors of development when existing routes will accommodate added infrastructure. The proposal's to direct these transmission lines over the Galiuro Mtns and/or through the San Pedro River Valley should be dismissed out-of-hand for their complete disregard for the natural and social values of the landscapes they would trample. What is the reason that such unwarranted despoilation can even be considered? For the convenience of private individuals' desire for profit, are we to allow areas of natural and agricultural abundance to be degraded, compromised, industrialized? When there already exists in the I-10 corridor every manor [sic] of transportation?</p>	
1002	<p><b>DISREGARD OF THE AESTHETIC, NATURAL AND CULTURAL:</b> SunZia initially said that it would strive to place the transmission lines where there power lines rights of way, roads and other intrusions into the land already exist. Route E-80 through our ranch is the route being studied that crosses more virgin unspoiled pristine public lands than any other route. The southern route along Interstate 10 is the logical place to locate the lines. It should go along outside the east boundary of the White Sands Missile Range and then follow Interstate 10. In the alternative the route along highway 340 is preferred. Even route E-10 is near a pipeline and other improvements. Placing the lines along E-80 shows no regard to the aesthetic, natural or cultural condition of the land.</p>	Boyd Ranch LLC
1010	<p>I have two alternate route suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. follow Interstate 40, from northern New Mexico through Arizona to California.</li> <li>2. follow the railroad tracks from New Mexico to California.</li> </ol> <p>If the transmission lines follow the I-10 corridor they will go through the small residential area of Mescal. The towers are unsightly enough especially when they're so close to home. As a resident of the Mescal area [Mescal Lakes Subdivision], we receive no benefits from the electric power generated in New Mexico and sold to California.</p>	
1021	<p>I live in the community of Mescal just north of I-10 and West of Benson Arizona. One reason I chose to live here was this area has all utility lines buried underground. The views of the mountains are very enjoyable. Upon study of the maps it appears a more direct route for these lines would be northern Arizona possibly following I-40 route or valley areas north of Heber and west through less populated areas.</p>	
1029	<p>We reside in J-6 and have our business in Mescal, 9 miles west of Benson. We are strongly opposed to new lines being run in our area. We would strongly support the lines being run in the northern portion of the</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

<b>ID</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>AFFILIATION</b>
	state which is more sparsely populated, and where I understand lines currently exist.	
1034	No route for the Project should be considered except routes already ecologically damaged by extant energy transmission equipment, such as in the 1-10 corridor.	
1038	<p>When possible, follow existing utility corridors, roadways, or other previously disturbed areas.</p> <p>Southern Routes in the Vicinity of Interstate 10</p> <p>1) Beginning from the Arizona-New Mexico Border, we believe the proposed routes should parallel 1-10 (B 150 and Alternate 22) as much as possible before diverting north along highway 191 or further west. We are unclear of the rationalization of the three northern routes (B 160, B 170, Alternate 12 and Proposed 35) that go through the Peloncillo Mountains connecting with highway 191.</p> <p>2) The proposed route (F10) beginning near Wilcox, then heading south around the playa to Benson, could be detrimental to migratory sandhill cranes and waterfowl.</p> <p>3) Evaluate the feasibility of a new route following I-10 from northeast of Wilcox to Benson. In the proximity of the intersection of highway 191 with I-10, consider the feasibility of a route around the north end of the Little Dragoon Mountains.</p> <p>4) From the Benson area west, the 2 proposed routes closest to I-10 (F20, F31) are preferable to the more northern route near the Coronado National Forest/Rincon Mountains (F 40).</p> <p>5) The proposed route (F 110) passing through the Santa Rita Experimental Range is less desirable than the routes to the north.</p> <p>6) Route F43, which appears to largely follow a riparian corridor, is less preferable to the routes following I-10 through Tucson. Further west of Tucson, routes around Tucson Mountain Park that do not cross the Tucson Mitigation Corridor property are preferable.</p>	Arizona Game and Fish Department
1045	I would encourage the BLM to keep the Sunzia route to existing transmission or utility corridors that already cross the San Pedro and would oppose any new North/South transmission corridor.	Cochise County Supervisor
1058	In Arizona, we prefer an alternative that avoids the San Pedro River Valley and recommend a route situated as close as possible to the Interstate 10 corridor through the Tucson metropolitan area. This alternative would minimize impacts to migratory birds, federally listed species, bats, and ongoing cooperative land conservation efforts, including potential creation of a new NWR.	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1076	Cochise County has more privately owned land than any other AZ county. Do not put the lines through populated areas. Also wind energy is currently unreliable sources of electricity to use in this type of situation. I work with power companies all over the U.S. and I know this first hand. This "green" option has the ability to be "switched" to fossil fuel energy once the line is completed. We do not want our wonderful rural views turned into a steel tower city. Using I-10 corridor is just	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

<b>ID</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>AFFILIATION</b>
	wrong as it is highly populated. I moved here [Benson, AZ] for ruralness and views, don't take that away from us.	
1081	Routing through Tucson and more coordination with Tucson Power Electric Company will allow more local access to power in these lines and make much more efficient use of existing infrastructure corridors. It will avoid permanent damage to wilderness areas in the Galiuro Mountains and the riparian ecology of the San Pedro River.	
1140	My hope is that, as you develop an EIS for this project, you look at already developed areas, such as those in the proposed expansion corridors along I-10 or along existing power transmission lines, and find that development in more sensitive areas should be off the table.	
1226	I live on Skyline Interchange/I-10. We already have the DOE power line going through our property. I DO NOT want a 500 KV line going anywhere near our community. It would depress land/real estate values. There is also a question about health effects of such a high electromagnetic field around dwellings. Further, it would seem that if wind and solar energy sources are placed near or at the point of use, these large transmission systems would not be needed or could be built at a reduced capacity. Using I-10 as a corridor should not be considered- -because communities have been built along this interstate! Vail, Benson, J-6, Mescal, Skyline community all have experienced significant growth and therefore argue against an I-10 corridor route. Please don't ruin our view-shed throughout Cochise County.	
1255	We feel the following should be considered in this process: -Where ever feasible, existing corridors and transmission lines should be utilized.	National Parks Conservation Association
1258	I am pleased to see that the SunZia Project is now considering routes that follow the major infrastructure corridor along Interstate 10. Routes within the developed or highly disturbed areas near this corridor are the only appropriate routes for new high voltage lines in the project's Arizona study area.  Building a new major infrastructure corridor in the environmentally sensitive areas of the Aravaipa and San Pedro regions would cause permanent damage to our dwindling wilderness areas in southern Arizona, as well as loss of wildlife habitat and wildlife migration corridors.	
1298	With proper thought and planning, Sunzia Southwest can utilize high-voltage paths already in existence from Magdalena and Socorro, New Mexico through Springerville and Holbrook, Arizona, rather than creating havoc for property owners and businesses along the I-10 corridor.  Any plan that calls for the use along transportation corridors (utilities/railroad and/or transportation right-of-way) between Benson and Tucson will cut through developed residential communities, displacing many local residents. This would have a negative financial impact on this area; and, the potential for delaying the entire project in court for many years.	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1345	NPS applauds BLM’s consideration of using and possibly expanding the existing rights-of-way (ROW) that traverse New Mexico and Arizona: corridors that could carry the proposed SunZia additional transmission lines where utilities already exist. We believe that the appropriate concentration of these transmission lines could reduce land purchase/easement costs, limit or eliminate certain impacts, and expand partnering and sharing of utility infrastructure.	National Park Service
1360	What corridors are ultimately deemed necessary should be placed along already established rail and highway transportation corridors.	
1381	Tucson Routes The least environmentally harmful routes would include the proposed Tucson routes or possibly other Tucson routes not yet considered, including a route submitted by the Cascabel Working Group (CWG), dated May 28, 2010. To the greatest degree possible, these routes should follow existing transportation or transmission corridors in order to limit additional fragmentation of wildlife habitat and wildlife travel corridors.	Sierra Club et. al.
<b>CODE 033.00 Modifications to Alignment</b>		
889	I am encouraged that the routes will not dissect Windmill Ranches (326 lots), as previously proposed. Please consider route E10 or E80, not D10. E10 or E80 will make many land owners very happy.	
893	Please look at possible overhead Rio Grande crossing ~14-15 miles SE of Hatch where the river is in a narrow canyon with no agriculture. The lines could cross overhead there from mesa to mesa.	
990	The other comment is that there is an area of the Rio Grande south of Hatch where there's a narrow canyon, agricultural fields on either side the river and mesas on both east and west of the river where there could be an overhead crossing. And I don't know whether anybody has considered that possibility, but it's about 14 to 15 miles southeast of Hatch, right along the river.  And there's a stretch – I don't know – two or three miles where there's no agriculture because it's a narrow canyon , and that is a possible place where the crossing could be done overhead without risking a lot for the birds that might use the river, because there should be minimal use of the river by the birds since there's no fields there.	
1088	As a resident and land owner in Lincoln County, New Mexico, I am writing to express my support for the location of the proposed substation in our County, along with developed alternative routes that connect to this substation.  I am opposed to the expanded study area north of Socorro because this would unnecessarily increase the impact on the environment through additional miles of transmission lines.	
1110	Use Existing Information to Identify and Remove Routes with Known Impacts to Significant Cultural Resources We appreciate BLM’s identification of cultural resource priority areas	Center for Desert Archaeology; National Trust for Historic

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>based on information we and others have submitted. Unfortunately we are unable to discern how this information has influenced the design or consideration of proposed alignments. In particular, we draw your attention to the following line segments: C170, C400, C420, C430, C440, C443, C450, C460, C530, C540, C590, C790, F450, F461, F470, and F440. These routes, in particular, traverse cultural resource priority areas that have already been identified by CDA and despite the information provided no removal or re-alignment of these linkages has occurred since the beginning of the scoping process.</p> <p>Recommendation: Remove line segments C170, C400, C420, C430, C440, C443, C450, C460, C530, C540, C590, C790, F450, F461, F470, and F440 from further project consideration.</p>	Preservation
1142	<p>The routes we endorse are the least detrimental to Windmill Ranches. Those are E10 and E80. Our concern still lays heavily on the substations however. Please have sunzia keep in mind our home properties when making their decision.</p>	
1245	<p>Our lands which include industrial parks, residential subdivisions, master planned communities, retail and commercial centers are within the new study areas boundaries. The majority of these properties have been entitled and are in various stages of development planning, permitting and construction. Each property potentially impacted has obtained some level of federal, state, county or city acknowledgement of future development, including approved plan amendments, rezoning, development plans, permits, plats, and development agreements. Some Diamond Ventures' properties which have been initially identified as being within the Study Area include:</p> <p>Smith Ranch Rocking K Black Angus Mountain Vail Rita Commerce Rita Tech Park Houghton Town Center Hook M Verano Sycamore Park 503 Rail Park 1-10 Chevron</p> <p>It is possible that additional properties may be identified.</p> <p>The plans of SunZia Transmission LLC to construct and operate up to two 500 kilovolt transmission lines originating in Socorro or Lincoln County, New Mexico and going west for approximately 460 miles to Pinal County, Arizona should take into consideration the County and City designated growth areas and private lands approved for development.</p>	Diamond Ventures LLC
1326	<p>I am completely opposed to the idea of putting high-power lines over the Rio Grande anywhere near Bosque del Apache National Wildlife</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	Refuge. The most logical and least expensive alternative is to cross the river somewhere between Hatch and Las Cruces where in some areas the river runs narrowly between two high bluffs.	
<b>CODE 040.00 Land Use</b>		
888	The Rio Grande Agricultural Land Trust (RGALT) holds conservation easements on nearly 400 acres of farmland and riparian habitat in the middle Rio Grande. Project managers need to know where our easements are! We are legally bound to take legal action against projects like the power line.	Rio Grande Agricultural Land Trust
898	I am encouraged that the routes will not dissect Windmill Ranches (326 lots), as previously proposed. Please consider route E10 or E80, not D10. E10 or E80 will make many land owners very happy.	Windmill Ranches HOA
918	I have commented to the Bureau about my opposition to using the San Pedro area as a route for this project, which has a direct negative impact on environmental, current ranching lifestyle, and animal behavior. It would seem to me that this project is better suited to use an existing thoroughfare such as I-10 than creating havoc in a pristine area.	
952	<p>Saguaro Juniper Corporation has donated conservation easements on its deeded land in the San Pedro Valley to The Nature Conservancy because of the land's environmental importance. Apparently to avoid lands with conservation easements, the new proposed SunZia routes go around the deeded land in Sections 7 and 8 T13S R20E either to the north and east or to the south and west – staying on Arizona State Land (Routes C301-C331, C310-C311-C331, C275-C321-C341). This ignores the fact that the state land is as important environmentally as the adjacent private land with conservation easements.</p> <p>These small examples are representative of a larger theme which is that it is very important that the state lease land in the San Pedro Valley not be undervalued. There is a tendency to say such land is "only" state land and is inexpensive. Since economics is one of the factors in the route consideration I would like to emphasize my concern that the state land in the San Pedro Valley may be systematically undervalued economically and the urban and semi-urban land elsewhere systematically overvalued especially if looked upon in the long term taking into account ecosystem services and environmental connections. It is crucial that the environmental impact statement not undervalue the long-term economic importance of the state lands in the San Pedro Valley and the unique services they provide.</p>	
993	It's unsound practice to create new corridors of development when existing routes will accommodate added infrastructure. The proposal's to direct these transmission lines over the Galiuro Mtns and/or through the San Pedro River Valley should be dismissed out-of-hand for their complete disregard for the natural and social values of the landscapes they would trample. What is the reason that such unwarranted despoilation can even be considered? For the convenience of private individuals' desire for profit, are we to allow areas of natural and agricultural abundance to be degraded, compromised, industrialized?	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1090	As a resident and land owner in Lincoln County, New Mexico, I am writing to express my support for the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project. This project will help New Mexico achieve the goal of developing the state's renewable resources. New Mexico has taken a number of steps to encourage the development of renewable resources such as implementation of a renewable mandate of 20% by 2020, and the creation of the Renewable Energy Transmission Authority. The state's leaders recognize the value of converting wind, solar and geothermal resources into electricity and how it helps diversify the state's economy and achieve energy independence. The final steps towards fully enabling this goal will be the creation of transmission capacity to deliver the electricity to market. Without access to transmission, many of these renewable resources will remain stranded. The SunZia project should be granted all necessary permits to help New Mexico remain a leader in clean energy.	
1098	As a resident and land owner in Lincoln County, New Mexico, I am writing to express my support for the location of the proposed substation in our County, along with developed alternative routes that connect to this substation.	
1169	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The City of Tucson (City) is engaged in a long-term economic development and revitalization process for the Tucson Downtown. This effort is often referred to as Rio Nuevo. Siting of transmission lines could have a detrimental impact on this effort if they reduced the look and feel of the Downtown area. Rejuvenation of the Downtown is extremely important to the economic vitality of the entire region. Factors such as aesthetics play a critical role in the success of such efforts.</li> <li>• The City owned lands in Avra Valley are the site for both existing and proposed water supply facilities. Current facilities include recharge basins and recovery wells. Water supply is a major concern for the region and it is important that land uses adjacent to these lands not impair the function of existing facilities or the ability of the City to develop additional facilities.</li> </ul>	City of Tucson
1243	I live in the Avra Valley where the proposed "green" lines are supposed to run and I oppose this project for several reasons. 1. The proposal will run through both Federal and State land, which has been set aside. 2. It will destroy the wildlife corridor.	
1338	Renewable energy sources and energy conservation provide significant environmental benefits for birds, wildlife, and their habitats. The Audubon Society understands and supports developing some of the wind, solar, and geothermal resources as important steps to creating a sustainable energy economy and combating climate change. Audubon supports renewable energy development provided that it is sited, designed, constructed, and operated to responsibly minimize harmful impacts on the environment. In particular, we believe that siting of renewable power and transmission line development in New Mexico should contain appropriate stipulations regarding wildlife and avian resources inventory, mitigation, and monitoring, including the cumulative effects of expanded development in both space and time.	Audubon New Mexico

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1340	I am writing to register my support for one of the proposed routes for the SunZia renewable energy powerline. I favor the route that follows the western boundary of White Sands Missile Range, as proposed in the original 2008 application filing by SunZia. The route should avoid all wildlife refuges, wilderness areas, wilderness study areas, and areas of critical environmental concern.	
1353	<p>We, the Aravaipa Property Owners Association (APOA), are writing you to express our strong and unanimous opposition to the Aravaipa transmission line route proposed by the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project. This route cuts through more than 20 miles of the Aravaipa Canyon watershed, crosses Aravaipa Creek on the east side of the Canyon, and bisects the Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness administered by the Bureau of Land Management to the north and Galiuro Wilderness in the Coronado National Forest to the south.</p> <p>The proposed route would block the road-less wildlife migration corridor between the Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness and the Galiuro Wilderness in the Coronado National Forest, one of the last of this magnitude in the southwest. The importance of this 100-mile long corridor has not been taken into account because for some unknown reason the study area stops just north of the Galiuros and does not include the road-less areas to the north. This is an essential corridor for many animals, such as desert bighorn sheep, black bears, mountain lions, and mule deer, and it connects these two ecologically pristine areas. Overall, approximately 50 miles of the proposed route would pass through or within one mile of areas determined to be environmentally sensitive, the largest number of miles in this category of all the transmission line routes, proposed or alternative. More importantly, once the transmission lines are in place with their attendant maintenance access, they will act like a “gateway drug” to further access, first by off-road vehicles, then to more development and degradation.</p>	Aravaipa Property Owners Association
1376	I own approximately 20 acres in the Windmill Ranches. While I am for more transmission lines and understand that transmission is necessary to make wind power a reality in east central New Mexico, I can't believe that it is necessary for this project to pass through PRIVATE land. Given the large amount of property the government routinely mismanages, these lines should be put on the BLM land. These lines are for the public good (or at least we are told so). If it's for the public good, then put it on PUBLIC land.	
1396	<p>There are several Pima County Code issues to consider. Sandario, Mile Wide, Kinney, and Gates Pass Roads are designated Major Scenic Routes by the Pima County Zoning Code and have views of the proposed SunZia project. The intent of this designation is to preserve and enhance the visual resources of the natural and built environment. SunZia routes within one mile of TMP are also in the Pima County Buffer Overlay Zone.</p> <p>Pima County has a strong and consistent track record of opposing utility and transportation corridors that impact, are adjacent to or bisect TMP. SunZia Southwest Transmission project has identified several alternate</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>routes through the Cienega Valley subject to feasibility study that may impact Saguaro National Park East, the Coronado National Forest and most directly the County owned Bar V Ranch and riparian properties including the County's Cienega Creek Natural Preserve, designated an Arizona Heritage Water. Issues of concern regarding Routes F20, F30, F40 and F60 as identified on the SunZia May 2010 Arizona Land Use Resources Map. Specifically, Routes F20, F30 and F40 have significant, direct impacts on County lands purchased with public dollars to protect riparian corridors and provide wildlife linkages coinciding with these routes.</p> <p>The following comments pertain to the routes proposed in the Cienega Valley:</p> <p>The Cienega Creek Natural Preserve along with National Park and Forest fall within the Pima County Conservation Lands System. The SDCP identified priority vulnerable species, cultural resources, special management areas and critical linkages in this area that may be impacted by the SunZia Southwest Transmission project.</p>	
1396	<p>The Pima County Board of Supervisors established Conditions, Covenants and Restrictions (CC&amp;Rs) that pertain to nearly all of the land located within the Cienega Creek Natural Preserve (floodplain, floodway and flood erosion zone). Under these CC&amp;Rs, 'all parallel installations, including without limitation sewers, are prohibited'. Most of the proposed alternative routes proposed by the SunZia project not only directly impact County-owned or managed lands that were acquired with voter-approved bond funds with the expressed intent to manage specifically to protect and preserve the natural and cultural resources for present and future benefits to the citizens of Pima County, but also unique and sensitive areas that will be significantly, adversely impacted with little if any benefit. Given that the transmission line routes proposed pass through our area to deliver energy products outside of the County and will provide only marginal benefits inside the County, and the issues raised by Saguaro National Park and the Bureau of Reclamation, Pima County is opposed to all transmission routes proposed through Pima County. Until all of our concerns are satisfactorily addressed, particularly the issue of a comprehensive regional assessment of actual need and where such resources should be appropriately located, the County remains opposed to the SunZia project.</p>	Pima County
1398	<p>The proposed alternate route #1A along the Sevilleta National Wildlife Refuge and US Hwy 60 has another problem. The deed for the Sevilleta NWR has a specific reversionary clause, causing the land to revert back to the donating person or his heirs should the land use or condition be changed or altered in any way. This proposed project would clearly violate that clause, thereby causing the US Fish and Game department to lose its access and control over that important wildlife study area.</p>	
<b>CODE 041.00 Agency Land Management Plan</b>		
1040	<p>The expanded study area encompasses the Ladd S. Gordon properties, belonging to the NM State Game Commission and managed by NMDGF</p>	New Mexico Department of Game

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	to provide food and habitat for wintering waterfowl and other migratory birds.	and Fish
1052	<p>[T]he Avra Valley route that was discussed in that meeting would bisect Central Arizona Project's (CAP) Tucson Mitigation Corridor, which serves as a preserve for wildlife and plants and provides an undeveloped corridor for large mammals to move between the Tucson Mountains to the east and the Roskrige Mountains to the west. Reclamation acquired the 4.25-square-mile corridor as partial mitigation for biological impacts resulting from construction and operation of the CAP Tucson Aqueduct. Reclamation signed a cooperative agreement with the Arizona Game and Fish Department and the Pima County Parks and Recreation Department for the management of these lands, including agreement to oppose any further development within the corridor. Reclamation has consistently opposed, and continues to oppose, use of the corridor for any use that could adversely affect plants, wildlife, and wildlife movement for which the corridor was established.</p> <p>I would also point out that visual impacts from sensitive viewing areas such as the Arizona Sonora Desert Museum were a major issue during planning for the CAP Aqueduct in this area. The Tucson Mitigation Corridor, by preserving these 4.25 square miles of land from future development, helped to mitigate these impacts as well. Based on commitments we have made to prohibit future development within this mitigation corridor, we cannot support the Avra Valley route and do not believe it is a reasonable alternative that should be considered in the Environmental Impact Statement for the SunZia Project.</p>	Bureau of Reclamation
1223	<p>ATTACHED RESOLUTION</p> <p>A resolution of the Board of Directors for Friends of Saguaro National Park in opposition to construction of a SunZia power corridor route through the Avra Valley.</p> <p>WHEREAS, Saguaro National Park was established in 1933 to protect the giant saguaro cactus, and preserve superb examples of the Sonoran Desert ecosystem, while affording unique recreational opportunities for visitors ... and today, Saguaro National Park is the number one tourist destination in Southern Arizona, providing an economic impact of approximately \$75 million per year to the Tucson community; and</p> <p>WHEREAS, the Bureau of Land Management is considering an application from SunZia Transmission LLC for locating two parallel 500-kilovolt high-capacity transmission lines, extending from south-central New Mexico to south-central Arizona ... these lines delivering electricity generated from renewable sources; and</p> <p>WHEREAS, one of the routes proposed for environmental assessment would go through the Avra Valley, west of the Tucson Mountains, and near the west district of Saguaro National Park; and</p> <p>WHEREAS, this route would degrade the visitor experience at Saguaro National Park by destroying the scenic viewsheds and negatively impacting the Park's wilderness character; and</p> <p>WHEREAS, this route would negatively impact thousands of acres of protected public lands, including Saguaro National Park, Ironwood</p>	Friends of Saguaro National Park

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>Forest National Monument, Tucson Mountain Park, and the Central Arizona Project Canal mitigation corridor; and</p> <p>WHEREAS, this route would cut through sensitive habitat recommended for protection by Pima County's landmark Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan; and</p> <p>WHEREAS, this route would slice in half the Tucson Mitigation Corridor of the Bureau of Reclamation – nullifying the purpose for which it was preserved – and would be contrary to management guidelines that explicitly prohibit any development on these lands; and</p> <p>WHEREAS, this route would be contrary to the purposes for which the Tucson Mountain District of Saguaro National Park was established in 1961 – to protect these lands unimpaired for future generations to enjoy;</p> <p>NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors for Friends of Saguaro National Park expresses its opposition to the proposed SunZia power corridor route through the Avra Valley – while acknowledging the desirability of developing and transmitting renewable energy and calls upon SunZia Transmission LLC to select an alternative route with fewer environmental impacts.</p>	
1308	<p>Protected Status Lands and Partners</p> <p>Given the international significance of the San Pedro River, the outstanding biodiversity of the region, and the extent of the largely unfragmented and relatively intact landscape of the MSPRV, it is not surprising that there are a plethora of protected status lands and working partners in the area. Perhaps the only surprise is that there are so many, exhibiting nearly as much diversity as the land itself. Here follows a brief summary of those efforts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Muleshoe Cooperative Management Area (CMA) with 57,500 acres is jointly managed by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Forest Service (USFS), Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD), and The Nature Conservancy (TNC). It includes art of the Galiuro Wilderness, Redfield Canyon Wilderness, and Hot Springs Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC). As the CMA report states, "Since ecosystems do not stop at traditional boundary lines...," managers looked across boundaries to develop an active partnership between public and private interests to work on the plan. An interdisciplinary team of resource specialists from the BLM, AGFD, USFS, TNC, Soza Mesa Ranch, Saguaro-Juniper Association, and Bayless and Berkalew Company was convened to develop the plan. It is noteworthy that though east valley SunZia routes take pains to skirt the Muleshoe CMA, they run through Soza Mesa, Saguaro-Juniper and Bayless and Berkalew who are all neighboring ranches that have similar resources and management concerns.</li> </ul> <p>In the Muleshoe CMA, Wildlife and its habitat are managed cooperatively under a Master Memorandum of Understanding (MOD) (1987) between BLM and the Arizona Fish and Game Commission. The BLM manages habitat for species identified as Wildlife of Special Concern by AGFD in conformance with state objectives which are identified in the AGFD Wildlife 2000 Strategic Plan. Federally listed species and those proposed for listing are protected by the Endangered</p>	Cascabel Working Group

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>Species Act of 1973 as amended (ESA). The BLM is mandated to protect threatened and endangered species and the ecosystems (habitats) upon which they depend.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Safford District RMP designated the 16,763 acre Hot Springs Watershed ACEC for the protection of riparian, cultural, and fish and wildlife values including threatened and endangered species values.</li> <li>• The Pima County A-7 Ranch is part of Pima County's award-winning Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan and extends from the forests of the Catalina Mountains to the San Pedro River. Using 2004 voter-approved bond monies, the County acquired Six Bar Ranch and the A7 Ranch in the San Pedro River Valley, included 6,800 acres of fee lands, the 34,000-acre State grazing lease, and the 80-acre Bureau of Land Management grazing permit. The County manages the ongoing ranching operations, while conserving and protecting biological and ecological values of the lands. "The overall biological goal in this subarea adopted by the Science Technical Advisory Team is to protect native plants, animals and natural communities of the Middle San Pedro River throughout Pima County by maintaining and/or restoring ecological and evolutionary processes that sustain them within a largely unfragmented landscape."</li> </ul>	
1368	<p>We have reviewed the route alternatives map and specifically recommend Route numbers A181 and A300 (or alternately, A250) as the Proposed Route for the SunZia DEIS:</p> <p>The route cuts diagonally west-southwest from the new sub-station north of Carrizozo, past the northwest corner of White Sands Missile Range (WSMR) property just south of Highway 380, where it turns immediately south, following the WSMR boundary to the point where the line must head west in order to cross the Rio Grande just south of Arrey, NM. There are several reasons that this route makes the most sense [including]:</p> <p>It avoids private Conservation Easements in the middle Rio Grande Valley north of Bosque del Apache. In addition to working on habitat preservation in the middle Rio Grande Valley as described above, RGALT has been working with private landowners, the USDA Farmland Protection Program, and the State of New Mexico to preserve critical farmlands in this area. All of the alternative routes that cross the Rio Grande north of Bosque del Apache will negatively impact these government – private collaborations to preserve farmland and habitat.</p>	Rio Grande Agricultural Land Trust
<b>CODE 042.00 Wilderness</b>		
1007	<p>We are ranchers that live on the path of the proposed E90 route, running south off routes E80 and E100. We own and operate this 30 section ranch and it provides our major source of income. The headquarters is at 34.4°50.8"N, 106.30°33.6"W. The E90 route is shown to run through our front yard, as well as through our BLM and NM State land leases.</p> <p>[O]ur ranch's western, leased BLM land is part of the Stallion WSA, a preserve in the Sierra Larga Hills. Placing power lines just a short walk from this WSA, with all their hazards, is unacceptable because it would destroy those attributes that are the reasons the land was preserved in the first place.</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1036	I specifically recommend Route numbers A 181 and A300 (or alternately, A250) as the Proposed Route for the SunZia DEIS. It avoids all NWRs, WSAs, WAs, ACECs, and conservation easements.	
1037	The Study Expansion route north to Belen is also a poor choice. The route goes through the Ladron Peak Wilderness Area vicinity and unnecessarily swings out of line to Belen.	
1047	In addition, both districts of the park contain substantial designated Wilderness areas, comprising over 78% of the park's total acreage. According to the Wilderness Act, areas with this designation must be managed in their primitive condition, where "the impact of man's work [is] substantially unnoticeable." Location of the transmission lines adjacent to either unit of the park would have significant negative impacts to both the park's viewshed and its Wilderness Character. The San Pedro River Valley, on the east side of the Rincon Mountain District of the Park, is an important wildlife corridor and link to other protected natural areas such as the Galiuro and Redfield Canyon Wilderness Areas.	National Park Service – Saguaro
1081	The Aravaipa/Galliuros wilderness areas should not be used as source of cheap public land in order to maximize corporate profits and control of energy resources for the project sponsors.	
1084	These comments are submitted in response to the addition of alternative routes for the SunZia Transmission Project in the Tucson area. Routes currently proposed by SunZia would run lines over a historic neighborhood or adjacent to a National Park which blatantly overlooks the historic, ecological, and wilderness values of southern Arizona. It is not appropriate to bisect the cluster of Wilderness Areas in the Galiuro Mountain region or damage the massive conservations efforts in the San Pedro riparian zone for the sake of corporate or mega-metropolitan interests.	
1166	Concerning the proposed route for SunZia's powerline across the northern ends of Socorro and Polvadera, I strongly urge you to reconsider the corridor proposed in SunZia's original 2008 filing, which follows White Sand's western fence line. I agree with the Fish and Wildlife Service that this western boundary route is the most reasonable in that it protects wildlife along the Rio Grande flyway and has the least impact on our communities. As pointed out by Kathryn Albrecht in her column in the May 29 edition of the El Defensor Chieftain, it alone avoids all Wildlife Refuges, Wilderness Areas, WSAs and BLM areas of critical environmental concern.	
1200	I oppose a new corridor being opened that could cross: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• heritage areas</li> <li>• wildlife corridors</li> <li>• our remaining designated or non-designated Wilderness areas in the Aravaipa riparian areas will be disturbed.</li> </ul>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1225	<p>I am a member of the Board of Directors of Apaches of Aravaipa Canyon, Inc., a 501 (c) (3) dedicated to conserving and interpreting the natural and historic site of what has been called the Camp Grant Massacre.</p> <p>This site, which occupies some 200 acres in the Aravaipa wilderness, once served as the home base of the Aravaipa Apache, whose name in Apache is in fact is taken from the Canyon's black rocks. As you can imagine, the Aravaipa wilderness is very sacred to the Apache people.</p> <p>As the site too of a terrible massacre carried out against Apache women, children and elders, it also has an important historic dimension for the Apache people – and for the people of the United States as a whole, as the event was to have a profound impact on our relations with Native peoples and shape who we later become as a nation.</p> <p>Having giant transmission lines run near the Canyon would irreparably harm the pristine nature of the site and in so doing destroy its historic character and beyond that degrade the sacred burial site, where the bodies of the 200 Apache civilians slain during the massacre still lie.</p> <p>The fact that Aravaipa remains a "wilderness" is something of a rarity and worthy of special consideration. In preserving its natural beauty, we preserve its sacred cultural and historic character as well.</p>	Apaches of Aravaipa Canyon, Inc.
1279	<p>As a resident of Southern Arizona and Tucson, I have to express my deep concerns about some of the proposed routes for the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project. I am especially distressed that the route through the wilderness area in the Aravaipa area seems to be the preferred route at the moment. The fact that this area has fewer human residents and thus you receive fewer "NIMBY" complaints does not make this area less worthy of your protection. (The route through the San Pedro area would also be very undesirable, but as that area has a strong advocacy group and seems to have been removed from serious consideration, my comments will focus on the Aravaipa route.) The Aravaipa area is a part of a large, relatively undisturbed (and roadless) wilderness area. It is a migration route and haven for many animals that would not thrive with much human encroachment. Not only would the construction and presence of the power lines cause substantial disturbance in itself, but it would open a much easier path for subsequent destruction such as that which would be caused by ATVs. Such traffic would be unavoidable once the access road and clearing that would necessarily accompany the power lines are built. Humans who currently have access to this area by backpacking, tend to have a much greater respect for and a much lower impact on nature than those who might gain entry on motorized vehicles. Once desecrated, it will be much more difficult to successfully oppose further development and roads in the area, and another pristine wilderness area and much of its fauna will be lost.</p>	
1310	<p>I am particularly concerned with the route proposed as E80, E90 &amp; E100.</p> <p>Ecological Impact</p> <p>Why would you choose to run a large set of power lines thru some 1500 square miles of pristine area? These areas from Bernardo to Gran</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>Quivira, south to Highway 380, to the Rio Grande River have no highways, no large power lines, no radio relay towers, in fact no development other than LC94 site operated by the WSMR on a site of 40 acres.</p> <p>It would also pass between the Stallion WSA, with a view shed rating of 2 and the south boundary of the Sevilleta refuge. In fact it parallels the Sevilleta for the entire south boundary of the Sevilleta and would be visible from the entire upper part of the refuge.</p>	
1354	<p>I am writing to voice my opposition to SunZia’s proposed transmission routes through Arizona’s wilderness areas, including the Aravaipa and the San Pedro.</p> <p>Our state’s wilderness areas should not be sacrificed in order to provide an energy source for other states.</p>	
1359	<p>My husband and I are landowners in Aravaipa Canyon, and we hope to retire there. As such, I am gravely concerned about SunZia’s proposed high power transmission routes through our beautiful area. It strikes me as immensely hypocritical that an energy project devoted to delivering “green” energy would willingly efface millions of acres of wilderness. But then, these are Arizona wilderness areas – meanwhile, those who stand to benefit most from the project are private investors, along with residents of California and New Mexico. Why should they care?</p>	
1368	<p>[W]e strongly recommend that you select the original (2008) “Proposed Route” across New Mexico as “Preferred Alternative” for the eastern (New Mexico) portion of the powerline. We have reviewed the route alternatives map and specifically recommend Route numbers A181 and A300 (or alternately, A250) as the Proposed Route for the SunZia DEIS:</p> <p>The route cuts diagonally west-southwest from the new sub-station north of Carrizozo, past the northwest corner of White Sands Missile Range (WSMR) property just south of Highway 380, where it turns immediately south, following the WSMR boundary to the point where the line must head west in order to cross the Rio Grande just south of Arrey, NM.</p> <p>There are several reasons that this route makes the most sense:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It passes through unpopulated federal lands and avoids populated agricultural and scenic areas.</li> <li>2. It avoids all National Wildlife Refuges, Wilderness Study Areas, existing Wilderness Areas, and Areas of Critical Environmental Concern. The study expansion in the middle Rio Grande Valley north of Socorro (from April 2010) makes no sense, as it considers new routes that include more private lands and rural population centers, and more of the Rio Grande waterfowl migratory flyway.</li> </ol>	Rio Grande Agricultural Land Trust
1381	<p>While we understand the need for additional transmission, that transmission must be appropriately located to avoid or minimize harm to wildlife, wildlife habitat, or wilderness values, among other important issues.</p> <p><i>Transmission Routes – Aravaipa Canyon</i></p> <p>This proposed route is unacceptable and unreasonable and should be</p>	Sierra Club et. al.

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>removed from further consideration. It would impact the Aravaipa Canyon watershed by cutting through it for more than 20 miles, crossing Aravaipa Creek, and fragmenting connectivity between two wilderness areas – Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness and Galiuro Wilderness. This area is one of the largest unfragmented wildland blocks in southern Arizona. A new transmission corridor would impair wilderness characteristics and values and would likely lead to unintended and undesirable impacts to this intact wildland complex.</p> <p>The proposed Aravaipa route passes within two miles of the Aravaipa Wilderness boundary. The intervening two miles contain roads that are recommended for closure and lands that are recommended as an "Area to be Managed for Wilderness Characteristics" in a Sky Island Alliance report. This same report contains a citizens-proposal for Wilderness Additions to the existing Galiuro Wilderness Area managed by the Coronado National Forest, which together with the sensitive BLM lands to the north, constitute a priority area for wildlands protection and maintenance of north-south ecological connectivity.</p>	
1381	<p>New Mexico Wilderness Alliance Citizen’s BLM Wilderness Inventory Units in the Quebradas</p> <p>The E130, E110, and A90 would cut across the Sierra de la Cruz, Veranito, and Stallion New Mexico Wilderness Alliance Citizen’s Wilderness Inventory Units, respectively. In order to maintain the well documented wilderness characteristics and values of these and adjacent areas in the “Quebradas” wildlands complex east of Socorro, we recommend excluding these routes from further consideration.</p>	Sierra Club et. al.
<b>CODE 043.00 Grazing and Ranching</b>		
884	<p>I do not believe the new proposals address the issues of a river crossing between Bosque del Apache and Belen. Any crossing must be underground to preserve the integrity of the daily flight paths of sandhill cranes and migratory routes for other birds. Routes adjacent to Belen still mar the landscape/viewscape as they come past Socorro and San Antonio. Any new lines between San Antonio and Belen will damage our already struggling farmers and our ecotourisms bas that is inherently tied to our open spaces and beautiful scenery.</p>	
1002	<p>This firm represents Boyd Ranch, LLC, a New Mexico limited liability company. Attached are the Comments to the proposed transmission lines and their location and the damages that will be suffered by Boyd Ranch if these routes cross the Boyd Ranch New Mexico state grazing leases.</p> <p>Cc: Curt and Susan L. Boyd, Managing Members of Boyd Ranch, LLC</p> <p>The E-80 route on the proposed SunZia Transmission Project crosses our New Mexico Grazing Leases GM 3065, GO 1550, and GO 1191 and comes very close to our house and the ranch headquarters on fee simple land. That route will significantly affect our ranch and our way of life in the following ways:</p> <p>other independent ranches in New Mexico is made up of a few hundred acres of fee simple land and three New Mexico state grazing leases. The grazing leases are considered and valued when ranches are being</p>	Boyd Ranch LLC

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>bought-and-sold or appraised for refinancing. Even though the transmission lines (E-80 and E-10) being studied for location are on state land, it will devalue our ranch (and others) without any compensation to us for our losses. We will lose part of our grazing land. During construction there will be considerable loss of grass due to the traffic and construction equipment. We may be unable to use the pastures where the construction is occurring.</p> <p>There are natural springs near route E-80 which provide water for wildlife and for livestock and provide an oasis for wildlife. A family of owls' nest and raise their young in the brush near that spring every year (and probably many other animals and birds we have not identified.). When the natural conditions around them change, especially construction activity, there is a danger of losing this beautiful and historic spring which provided water to the many Native Americans who inhabited and hunted in this area, to the Spanish shepherders and still to wildlife, livestock and hunters with a year round water supply in the desert.</p> <p>Route E-80 comes near to the historic Spanish village of Chupadero (of which our ranch is a part) where the ruin of the Catholic Church still stands.</p> <p>The independent dry land rancher has been important to the culture of New Mexico. We ranchers struggle to make it and we help one another to keep an important way of life going for the future. These locations at E-80 and E-10 for these transmission lines have disregarded these ranches and this part of New Mexico's culture. With 100's of sections of lands available, the proposed transmission lines at E-80 and E-10 go within 1/2 mile of seven ranch headquarters/houses. The lines go over one of our windmills and one of our sets of corrals. This is inexcusable. These are improvements we own on our state grazing leases for which we apparently will not be compensated.</p>	
1007	<p>We are ranchers that live on the path of the proposed E90 route, running south off routes E80 and E100. We own and operate this 30 section ranch and it provides our major source of income. The headquarters is at 34.4°50.8"N, 106.30°33.6"W. The E90 route is shown to run through our front yard, as well as through our BLM and NM State land leases.</p> <p>[T]hese power lines are environmentally objectionable because they will disrupt Native American home sites going back several hundred years, the homestead sites of the early pioneers who first came to this valley in the late 1800's and the activities of the current ranchers who have invested their time and resources into preserving and improving these grasslands while producing wholesome food.</p> <p>[T]he power lines would be costly to our ranch operation because of decreased property values and interruption of our ranching operation. Our ranch is the result of a lifetime of hard work and saving, and these power lines degrade the home we have worked to build.</p>	
1044	<p>My family purchased our ranch two miles south of Gran Quivira in the early 1900's which has been the heart and soul of our family as well as</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>the personal connection I have to my homeland. As a New Mexico resident proud of my ranching heritage, I feel that it is necessary to express my utter dismay with a proposal from SunZia Power Company for installing high voltage power lines on or near my families' property at Gran Quivira. This proposal, if put into action will destroy and permanently alter the very foundation of New Mexico's heritage, culture, and economic means of production in relation to ranching.</p>	
1227	<p>We understand that these transmission lines are huge and will transmit tons of power to Arizona, but we are extremely concerned about the projects potential effects on our lively hood. We raise cattle and horses. These animals forage on the property you are talking about installing these lines on. Have there been any studies on the effects this will have on cattle or horses? The way we see it is, if these towers go up: We won't get any overhead flight money, we will lose all of our hunting licenses, and our cattle won't have calves. How are we supposed to survive?</p>	
1234	<p>As permanent residents and ranchers of New Mexico in the Scholle and Chupadera areas (approximately 5-25 miles south of Rt. 60 and 10-25 miles west of Mountainair) we are absolutely opposed to the "Study Area Expansion April 2010". Referencing your maps dated April 23,2010, from the proposed SunZia-East Substation to the San Antonio area turning-point-south, we request that both northerly proposed routes known as "E10" and "E80" (in the expansion study) and route "A50-60-90" (in the original study) be removed from further consideration.</p> <p>While we believe the best pathway for this entire 460 miles of 500kv transmission line, fair and suitable to the people and wildlife of New Mexico, is simply underground, we do recognize this as cost prohibitive. However, portions of this transmission line must go underground: especially all or portions of the originally proposed "A30-40-80" lines from SunZia-East Substation continuing west to San Antonio along Route 380.</p>	
1268	<p>Existing and Reasonably Foreseeable Impacts to Davidson Canyon/Cienega Creek Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.</p> <p>Loss of ranching opportunities (large proposed right of way).</p>	<p>Empire-Fagan Coalition</p>
1273	<p>I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed 500Kv power line. The E80-110-120 route will cross my property near Gran Quivira N.M. This property has been in my family for three generations. My Grandfather and Father have farmed and ranched on this land for almost one hundred years. They have nurtured and protected this land for me and future generations of my family. I want to also state that I am completely against all other routing proposals which will negatively impact agricultural lands. We take great pride in having some of the last remaining property in the western United States which has remained aesthetically pleasing. Implementation of such an unsightly non-essential transmission line will eternally impact the available uses of this property as well as disrupt the natural ecological environments of wildlife.</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1368	<p>We have reviewed the route alternatives map and specifically recommend Route numbers A181 and A300 (or alternately, A250) as the Proposed Route for the SunZia DEIS:</p> <p>The route cuts diagonally west-southwest from the new sub-station north of Carrizozo, past the northwest corner of White Sands Missile Range (WSMR) property just south of Highway 380, where it turns immediately south, following the WSMR boundary to the point where the line must head west in order to cross the Rio Grande just south of Arrey, NM.</p> <p>There are several reasons that this route makes the most sense [including]: It avoids private Conservation Easements in the middle Rio Grande Valley north of Bosque del Apache. In addition to working on habitat preservation in the middle Rio Grande Valley as described above, RGALT has been working with private landowners, the USDA Farmland Protection Program, and the State of New Mexico to preserve critical farmlands in this area. All of the alternative routes that cross the Rio Grande north of Bosque del Apache will negatively impact these government – private collaborations to preserve farmland and habitat.</p>	Rio Grande Agricultural Land Trust
1405	<p>Effect on Livestock and Wildlife</p> <p>Studies have shown that the large electromagnetic radiation emanating from high-voltage transmission lines adversely affects livestock and wildlife as it interferes with their migratory instincts. An Iowa study showed that livestock congregated under the high-voltage transmission lines thus interfering with their grazing habits. It must be remembered that livestock on our ranches are part of the food chain and the less trauma and disturbance they suffer the better. The radiation would also affect the Wildlife and Waterfowl NWR's along the Rio Grande river by interfering with their migratory instincts of these wildlife and birds.</p>	
<b>CODE 044.00 Private Lands/Property Values</b>		
881	SunZia lines should be kept out of the San Pedro Valley. New power transmission corridors should instead be placed along already established rail and highway corridors. The construction and maintenance of the proposed SunZia transmission lines would impact water and wildlife resources in SE Arizona, already under stress, and undermine property values and eco-tourism opportunities in the area.	
887	The proposed route running north to south just west of Bosquecito Rd is totally unacceptable to me – it would [] my viewscape and lower my property value.	
892	Regarding sections A60, A90, and A80 – these proposed lines are within 3 miles of our headquarters/homes. My children are the 5th generation in my family to live on this ranch. We have approximately 1,200 acres of deeded land and I will not consider any easements or right of ways on my property.	
895	In regards to proposed routes A90 and A60, this proposed route runs just (approximately) 1.5 miles south of my ranch. This route is also in the northern FIX evacuation range of WSMR. These routes would greatly	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	affect the value of my ranch not to mention the hazard to animals and airplanes. WSMR flies night missions and day light at very low altitudes. These are bad enough without the added hazard of these power lines. I propose you run the line down D800 or the E80 – E100 routes. Also, E10 follows Hwy 60 which is flatter and a better route.	
897	We own a 40-acre farm in San Antonio – along the A-130 and A-140 proposed route. We built a two-story Victorian house and running those horrible power lines near my home will definitely destroy the view. We put the propane tank in back and buried the electrical lines to keep the Victorian house looking aged and in that period. We have animals, chickens, quail, dogs, horses, etc. that won't be delighted with power lines. San Antonio is a tiny town and it is inconceivable to me why with all the open space in NM you would select to run these lines through our town. And I do not believe it will lower costs of electricity – but it will lower the value of my farm.	
900	do not want this power line to pass through Bingham to San Antonio, NM (A80/A60). First of all, New Mexico residents receive no benefit by allowing SunZia to install 200 ft per line, 1000 ft for 2 lines, 130 to 160 feet high, 1300-1500 feet between structures on BLM, wildlife refuge, private deeded land north or south of Hwy 380 or Rt. 525 to Stallion Range Center (WSMR) in order to provide urban/suburban areas of Phoenix, AZ with power to fuel their energy demands. As a private landowner I resist the implication of installation of these powerlines on wildlife, ranchers, Indian artifacts, WSMR airspace, scenic beauty, disruption of the ecosystem in the fragile desert climate to hawks, antelope, cattle, jackrabbits, snakes, etc. As a landowner, I don't want the ugly humming and sight of powerlines on my open spaces. Open spaced are becoming increasingly rare. Also, I don't want the impact of power land values in this rural isolated areas.	
937	This powerline should completely avoid all the routes north of the Catalina Mountains. Those routes would adversely impact the ecological and cultural resources in that area. Not only would it cause environmental damage associated with the San Pedro Valley, but those routes would fragment a large block of State Trust and private lands and therefore harm the ranches in that area.	
956	I live in the Avra Valley and operate a vacation rental on 10 acres of beautiful desert. I have heard that there are plans to put a power line up the Avra Valley.  This is a very troubling proposal and I am totally opposed to it. Not only would it be a major disruption to our views, but it would have a damaging impact on my rental property business. Guests constantly remark on the sunset views to the west, the sunrise over the Tucson Mountains and the general sense of quiet beauty on the western slopes of the Tucson Mountains. The Arizona Sonora Desert Museum is located here for a reason – the unspoiled beauty of this area. Please do not destroy this unique desert habitat Use existing routes for power transmission, don't spoil more desert.	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
958	We are totally against having this go anywhere our property at Windmill Ranches. We and our children own lots, 86, 87, 88 and 89. We wanted to attend this meeting but will be unable to do so. Please do not put this line where people are planning on retiring in the future. It will totally ruin our property.	
985	[W]e're on the north end of the area for the White Sands Missile Range northern area, and we're on County Road 121. And by looking at these maps, the proposed line at E80 would come right – it's E80 100 turns, it goes right between our house and the optic site, or right close to the optic site that we have a contract with the Army for the optics for L94, LC94, which is the proposed well, it's the launching pad for the missile. And then we have the optic site. They're on two sites so they can get triangulation. So we would like to see that thing – if they are going propose, it put it in that area, we understand; but we would like to see it go north of the LC optic and north of our house and north of John Sais, S-A-I-S. Because talking to the Army people, if we run it farther south that will become unusable to the Army. So we'd lose or contract with them, and that's quite a bit of money. But if they could put it north, that would be fine.	
1002	<p>The E-80 route on the proposed SunZia Transmission Project crosses our New Mexico Grazing Leases GM 3065, GO 1550, and GO 1191 and comes very close to our house and the ranch headquarters on fee simple land.</p> <p>One of the best markets for small ranches in New Mexico now is for subdivision into ranchettes with common wildlands. This is occurring on nearby lands.</p> <p>Having the transmission lines just on the edge of our fee simple property will totally spoil it for a sale of that nature.</p> <p>The nuisance of the noise from the humming of the lines will affect us and that, together with the general fear of health issues and safety, will be a real deterrent to prospective buyers.</p> <p>The study area is one mile wide with a view to future development. In other words, the intention is to add more and more lines to this corridor. All of the issues mentioned above will be exponentially magnified as "future development" occurs. This factor will be a major deterrent to a future buyer of the ranch. It devalues our ranch.</p> <p>The independent dry land rancher has been important to the culture of New Mexico. We ranchers struggle to make it and we help one another to keep an important way of life going for the future. These locations at E-80 and E-10 for these transmission lines have disregarded these ranches and this part of New Mexico's culture. With 100's of sections of lands available, the proposed transmission lines at E-80 and E-10 go within 1/2 mile of seven ranch headquarters/houses. The lines go over one of our windmills and one of our sets of corrals. This is inexcusable. These are improvements we own on our state grazing leases for which we apparently will not be compensated.</p>	
1005	The Socorro Soil and Water Conservation District (SSWCD) wishes to voice its concern regarding the proposed routes of the SunZia	Socorro Soil and Water Conservation

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	Transmission line. While the proposed renewable energy project has benefits that are sustainable, construction of this type of transmission line will have a tremendous negative impact on surrounding property values, thereby reducing our mill levy contributions, and, in turn, our operating budget. This will reduce our capacity to carry out local conservation projects that benefit stakeholders in New Mexico.	District
1007	We own and operate this 30 section ranch and it provides our major source of income. The headquarters is at 34.4'50.8"N, 106.30'33.6"W. The E90 route is shown to run through our front yard, as well as through our BLM and NM State land leases.  ...the power lines would be costly to our ranch operation because of decreased property values and interruption of our ranching operation. Our ranch is the result of a lifetime of hard work and saving, and these power lines degrade the home we have worked to build.	
1019	Apparently the "Preferred" or "most Probable" route goes right through the established community of Mescal which has many established residences and several businesses. My wife and I moved out here for a quiet rural lifestyle where we could have our horses at hand and enjoy our approaching retirement. We have worried hard shedding blood, sweat, and tears building our retirement home and horse facilities and have no intentions giving them up so some corporation can make money selling interstate power. This line needs to be routed where it will not disrupt peoples homes and lives. The buyouts of residences and properties would seem too expensive to be economically feasible anyway as opposed to open country.	
1020	I own property in the windmill ranches subdivision in Ancho, NM I have been following the discussion of the Sunzia Transmission lines and note that the current proposed routes do not cut across the windmill ranches properties. I do not appreciate that Sunzia has chosen not to affect our property and property values. Of the routes proposed, obviously the least preferable one is the one that runs along RT. 54. Also, it would be much appreciated if the substation were not located in any that encompass the windmill ranches property.	
1022	Thank you for eliminating the route through our subdivision of windmill ranches! This shows process works: you asked for concerns, we gave them (along w/others) and as long as feasible, you adjusted the route. Now, we'd ask you do not select D10, as that would be our front view across the mountains. We prefer E10 as it is the farthest away. Another concern is the actual substation location. If it can go anywhere within the lined circle, the circle overlaps the subdivision. We understand you are considering and abandoned natural gas site. That would be a good way to reclaim the area and avoid private lands.	
1028	It stands to reason that a project such as this be undertaken with as little impact to private property and citizens as possible. The central state option seems to fit this goal best. I can think of a few selfish reasons why I would not like this line in my back yard, but the big picture is the least impact to the least number of people.	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1041	Please respect rural landowners of Polvadera and pursue the alternate route that follows the White Sands western fence line. Many of us have our rural lifestyle. It is unconscionable to take this from us.	
1146	<p>One of the possible routes you have proposed for the SunZia 500 KV power lines passes through San Acacia, Polvadera, and/or Lemitar in Socorro County. I strongly object to your using this corridor and ask that you use one of your alternate corridors instead. All things considered, the corridor(s) along White Sands would seem to be far better alternatives.</p> <p>My objection is based on (1) scientific evidence indicating possible links between EMFs and childhood leukemia, fibromyalgia, Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's, migraine headaches, sleep disorders, allergies, and asthma; (2) degradation of local property values because of potential buyers' concerns about health, neighborhood aesthetics, quality of life and diminished resale value ...</p>	
1148	<p>I am writing to voice my objection to one of the possible power line routes for the SunZia Transmission Project, specifically, the one within the corridor that passes through San Acacia, Polvadera and or Lemitar in Socorro County.</p> <p>I am also concerned about the obvious decimation of property values, owing to the fact that many people who might otherwise buy homes in this area would not do so if these high voltage lines were nearby, given concerns about health, aesthetics, quality of life and resale value.</p>	
1160	Please consider the proposed power line corridor that was proposed in SunZia's original 2008 filing – the route that follows White Sands Missile Range western fence line and crosses the Rio Grande south of the Caballo reservoir. This route will have the least impact on both bird migration paths and property values than the other proposed routes.	
1226	<p>I live on Skyline Interchange/I-10. We already have the DOE power line going through our property. I DO NOT want a 500 KV line going anywhere near our community. It would depress land/real estate values.</p> <p>Using I-10 as a corridor should not be considered--because communities have been built along this interstate! Vail, Benson, J-6, Mescal, Skyline community all have experienced significant growth and therefore argue against an I-10 corridor route. Please don't ruin our view-shed throughout Cochise County.</p>	
1227	<p>We have looked at the "proposed" map of where this transmission line is supposed to go. If it indeed follows the El Paso or Transwestern pipelines, you are crossing approximately 11 miles of our property. El Paso pipeline is approximately one-quarter mile from our house. Transwestern pipeline is one-half a mile from our house and the house up the road is directly between them. Our property lies in the southwest corner of Torrance County. We understand that these transmission lines are huge and will transmit tons of power to Arizona, but we are extremely concerned about the projects potential effects on our lively hood.</p> <p>This property has been in our family for three generations now (our</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	children being the fourth generation), and we enjoy living out there just for the beauty of the land itself. Besides the dangerous and financial aspect, these towers would just be a permanent scar on our property and we don't want them. When was anyone going to call the landowners and let us know they were going through the property that we own? Does private deeded land ownership not mean anything anymore?	
1228	The J-6 Mescal Community Development Organization appreciated the opportunity to review large wall maps which we shared with our neighborhoods located along the 1-10 corridor between and within the Buffalo Soldiers Electronic Testing Range and Pima County Conservation lands. Residents within our area mostly live in clustered population centers that cannot avoid impacts from the proposed powerline routes due to the narrow nature of the valley between the Whetstone Mountains and the Catalina Mountains. Rural qualities are highly valued in our tri-community area of J-6, Mescal, and Skyline as we serve as the western gateway to the San Pedro Valley and to Cochise County that markets its scenic vistas, remote recreational opportunities, western-movie production, and legendary history. Having parallel lines of 130' to 160' imposing towers is not conducive to the passive setting, experiences being marketed. Due to the topography of the valley, the powerline would be a visual scar that is seen and felt for miles. The two preferred routes will not only impact our commercially designated areas, but also lands zoned as neighborhood – residential. Due to the number of small acreage lots near the proposed routes, many residential property owners view the lines as a health hazard and a variable that will devalue their property or make it undesirable to prospective buyers.	J-6 Mescal Community Development Organization
1230	On behalf of the Friends of the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge I would like to convey our opposition to the proposed study area expansion, as it does not provide any new routes that would relieve our concerns regarding the wildlife and economy of our community. Routes with valley crossings between Socorro and Belen would still pose a hazard to the daily flight patterns of sandhill cranes and snow geese, as well as the migratory pathway for hundreds of thousands of other birds. The infrastructure for this transmission corridor will mar the landscape and be visible for many miles in the open vistas of the Middle Rio Grande Valley. Though population densities are low between Socorro and Belen, tourism and land values are tied to the unique views of the rolling hills of Sevilleta National Wildlife Refuge, the majesty of “M” Mountain, and the cottonwood gallery along the Rio Grande.	
1236	My husband and I purchased our 40 acres 10+ years ago to build our retirement home. We moved from Florida to our dream land in September 2008. How gorgeous. We enjoy so many aspects of the Windmill Ranches area – the many animals such as antelope and deer, the terrain and the views. We request that you consider the northern routes E10 and E80. These are the most favorable.	
1245	Our lands which include industrial parks, residential subdivisions, master planned communities, retail and commercial centers are within the new study areas boundaries. The majority of these properties have been entitled and are in various stages of development planning,	Diamond Ventures LLC

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>permitting and construction. Each property potentially impacted has obtained some level of federal, state, county or city acknowledgement of future development, including approved plan amendments, rezoning, development plans, permits, plats, and development agreements.</p> <p>The plans of SunZia Transmission LLC to construct and operate up to two 500 kilovolt transmission lines originating in Socorro or Lincoln County, New Mexico and going west for approximately 460 miles to Pinal County, Arizona should take into consideration the County and City designated growth areas and private lands approved for development. The Pima Association of Governments has a 2040 Regional Transportation Roadway Plan which should be used as a basis for alignments through the Tucson basin. To the greatest extent possible, the alignment should run through public lands within the Tucson metropolitan area. Such alignment should run primarily through State Trust lands south of I-10 within Pima County, and make every effort to avoid private property. To the extent that the alignment could ultimately be on, or in close proximity to private property with the resultant negative effects, it is important for private property owners potentially impacted by the alignment to have answers to the following:</p> <p>1. What are the property severance standards which will be used? If a portion of a large land holding is acquired to accommodate the line, how will the loss of value and loss or reduced use on the balance of the land be addressed?</p>	
1250	<p>Sue Moran, Administrator for the Tierra Grande Improvement Association, Inc. attended the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project Public Scoping Meeting in Socorro, NM on April 27, 2010. It was brought to her attention that two (2) of the proposed transmission line routes (N20 – N30) could impact our community. Tierra Grande Improvement Association is a rural residential development split between Valencia and Socorro County. We currently have over 140 homes in the area. It is bordered on the south by the Sevilleta National Wildlife Refuge and on the east by the Manzano Mountains/Cibola National Forest. Highway 47 runs north &amp; south through the middle of the development and Highway 60 runs east and west in southern portion. Our residents enjoy beautiful mountain views, star filled night skies, and unobstructed vistas.</p>	Tierra Grande Improvement Association, Inc.
1267	<p>Red Doc Farm is composed of Roland K. Sanchez, MD, Elia Sanchez, Jessica Sanchez, MD, Alicia Sanchez, M.S. Adolfo Sanchez, MD, Roland Sanchez II DDS, Florian Sanchez, 4th year Vet Student and Emilio Sanchez senior at Texas Tech – Animal Science. Red Doc Farm is currently renting 27 sections from Joan Donaldson, Donaldson Ranch.</p> <p>We are strongly opposed to one of the proposed routes for NM Sun Zia Project for the new electrical transmission lines from Corona, New Mexico through this pristine property for the following reasons:</p> <p>...We are asking that another route be found due to the economic, medical, and pasture concerns and the preservation of this pristine, untouched conglomerate of land with many third and fourth generation Ranchers trying to preserve a land and way of life. We strive to preserve this so that others may share this beauty. We ask who is New Mexico</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>Sun Zia? Do they have a contingency for compensation to those with medical effects and compensation to the Rancher for their economic loss due to their lines? Who are the members and owners and what are their resources?</p>	
1273	<p>I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed 500Kv power line. The E80-110-120 route will cross my property near Gran Quivira N.M. This property has been in my family for three generations. My Grandfather and Father have farmed and ranched on this land for almost one hundred years. They have nurtured and protected this land for me and future generations of my family. I want to also state that I am completely against all other routing proposals which will negatively impact agricultural lands. We take great pride in having some of the last remaining property in the western United States which has remained aesthetically pleasing. Implementation of such an unsightly non-essential transmission line will eternally impact the available uses of this property as well as disrupt the natural ecological environments of wildlife.</p> <p>I will under no circumstances let you or anyone defile this pristine property by crossing it with a 500Kv power line. There is a false impression that a corporation can purchase any right-of-way easement desired, however, monetary procurement will not purchase a change in ideology, heritage or tangible representations of my values.</p> <p>Knowing that property rights are the cornerstone to American success and freedom serves as the basis for my argument against this project. Americas founding fathers believed that private property held by the citizens of this nation would be the key to success and the foundation of American society. They were absolutely correct, private property is the sole factor in our success and fueled our manifest destiny which ensured our position as the worlds superpower.</p>	
1298	<p>The destruction of our property values and public/private lands to accommodate extremely dangerous high-tension lines erected along the I-10 corridor between Benson and Tucson, Arizona to promote a partnership deal between New Mexico and California, is outrageous. It has always been our understanding, wind and solar power generation is best created in the local vicinity of the user, and not transported over long distances. If California's current policies do not allow for the construction of power generation in their own state, they need to re-think those policies to accommodate their needs.</p> <p>California has a history of transporting all the resources they demand, for their own use, from other states without regard to the inconvenience or impact this causes others.</p> <p>With proper thought and planning, Sunzia Southwest can utilize high-voltage paths already in existence from Magdalena and Socorro, New Mexico through Springerville and Holbrook, Arizona, rather than creating havoc for property owners and businesses along the I-10 corridor.</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1310	<p>Following are my comments and questions on the proposed Sun Zia transmission project.</p> <p>Impact on the Extension Area of WSMR. I am particularly concerned with the route proposed as E80, E90 &amp; E100.</p> <p>Financial Impact. This size line also has to reduce the value of the ranch as a unit and the private land would be greatly affected. What studies have been done to try and quantify that loss of value? Is there a differentiation between sub dividable land and rangeland?</p>	
1313	<p>It has come to my attention that a potential routing alignment for a SunZia transmission line is in consideration which would dissect our 4600 acre Master Planned Community Willow Springs. For obvious reasons we would be opposed to this location because we feel that the aesthetical impact would significantly diminish the future value of our project.</p>	
1383	<p>First, THANK YOU for eliminating the route through the Windmill Ranches sub-division in Ancho, NM. We know nothing is finalized yet, but this gives us hope, and takes unwanted stress off our daily lives!!</p> <p>Second, these are our thoughts on the other proposed routes in our area: Please DO NOT SELECT D10, as that goes along our front mountain views. Our preference would be E10, which is North of, and farthest away from, the Ranch. Third, we have a concern about the actual placement of the sub-station. To our understanding, it can be placed anywhere inside the lined circle on the maps. The circle overlaps the sub-division. Now, there is talk that you are considering placing the sub-station on an abandoned natural gas site, with an airstrip. That seems like a good idea, as it far away, and a good way to re-use a site. Please continue to avoid our private land.</p>	
1398	<p>RE: (Proposed Alternate corridor routes #1 and #1A: 2 routes that would directly cross our land: 1) S. of Belen traveling SE to SunZia East substation along the natural gas pipeline easements or 1A) along the Sevilleta National Wildlife Refuge and US Hwy 60 traveling East to the pipeline route and then following the pipelines easements SE to SunZia East substation.</p> <p>We have several easements through our ranch already. Each one of them brings its own set of issues that we must deal with. Creating yet another easement corridor of 1000' wide through several sections of our ranch will push us beyond the limit. To force this project of two very large power transmission lines upon us, with its inherent problems, bisecting our ranch with yet another condemned easement is unconscionable. We will be overburdened by the shear number of easements crossing our ranch, especially in light of the past damages that we have suffered. We strongly object to any additional easement corridors being designated through our ranch property and we will fight any condemnation proceedings that would arise from these proposed routes through our ranch.</p>	
1403	<p>This Transmission Line will put in danger this historical heritage that is rooted in the Sais Ranch. There has been five generations on this ranch and our historical roots have been traced back 600 years.</p>	

<b>Table E-1 Comments Summary Table</b>		
<b>ID</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>AFFILIATION</b>
<b>CODE 045.00 Access</b>		
909	I am a conservation land owner in the San Pedro River Valley. The cultural, environmental and eco-economic resources of the San Pedro far outweigh any value 2 500kV lines might provide the area, or state. Irreplaceable archeology would be lost. A wilderness area from Sulfer [sic] Springs Valley to Tucson, Benson to San Manuel, would be fractured by roads and thus numerous washes/watersheds subject to erosion and extended ORV use.	
919	Using the existing I-10 ROW seems the most feasible and least costly of any. And yes it is unsightly – but spend money to deal with that rather than the huge expense of building roads over difficult terrain and very environmentally sensitive areas. Further, study tying into existing grids and only build what is needed. All the roads required to install and maintain the routes overland will be a wonderful draw for all the ATVerS who will further tear up and degrade the landscape.	
922	The northern route through the Aravaipa would be a huge mistake. The area is pristine supporting natural plant and wildlife. 500 high voltage lines through this area would open roads in areas that when it rains would destroy with erosion all the area around the disturbed ground. There are ranches in that area that have kept the area intact, and all the wildlife and plant life undisturbed. Opening access roads encourage ATV's etc. My suggestion is to follow lines already in place. Why reinvent the wheel. I have a home out there because it is pristine! Keep it that way.	Eureka Springs Property Owners Association
939	I oppose the proposed routes for the SunZia Southwest Transmission project in southern Arizona through the San Pedro River Valley, or in any other area that would be irreparably impacted environmentally, ecologically, and culturally.  The BLM holds a conservation easement on several properties to protect its ecological and cultural values. As a land owner in Cascabel (130 acres at the mouth of Hot Springs Canyon w/conservation easement), I am concerned that running a 1,000-ft utility corridor through the area is inconsistent with the BLM's own state conservation goals in the San Pedro River Valley. New roads, development, and infrastructure would cause irreparable damage to this fragile area.	
1038	General Comments  • Permanent or temporary construction/service roads and staging areas, needed to support the proposed transmission line, could have a substantive negative impact on wildlife and habitat. The use of existing roads is preferable over creating new roads. All new roads and staging areas should be kept to a minimum, restored to original condition (e.g., regarded, revegetated) if not needed for future service, and secured (e.g., fenced, gates) to prevent unauthorized traffic. Roads fragment habitat, disrupt wildlife movement patterns, contribute to soil loss through erosion, facilitate the spread of nonnative and invasive species, and provide new access points for off highway vehicle (OHV) traffic into previously undisturbed habitat. Disturbed areas should be reseeded with	Arizona Game and Fish Department

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>vegetation native to the site, utilizing seed collected from the project area to maintain the genetic integrity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the proposed project is authorized and some new service roads created, we may advocate for leaving specific roads accessible to sportsmen and outdoor recreationists. Identification of these service roads would require close coordination with the Department.</li> </ul>	
1058	<p>Our primary concern with the SR 191-US 70-Galiuro Mountain route is that it traverses between the Galiuro and Santa Maria mountains near the headwaters of Aravaipa Creek. This area presently has limited road access, and we anticipate the placement of a transmission line through this region would necessitate impacting an appreciable acreage of currently wild lands.</p>	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1168	<p>I am one of eleven households that are located in the vicinity of alternative route E10. We all live along County Road A-125, which runs south of U.S. Highway 60 at mile marker 191. Your route E10 crosses A-125 approximately three miles south of Highway 60. I have drawn County Road A-125 on your map entitled "Resource NM Ownership" for your reference and included it on the next page.</p> <p>As you consider alternative route E10 for your transmission line, please be aware of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The northernmost portion of A-125 is a one-lane bridge that crosses Abo Arroyo. This bridge has been condemned by the New Mexico Department of Transportation. While it remains open to local residents, it is not safe for commercial vehicles or other heavy equipment.</li> <li>2. A-125 is a one-lane dirt road that winds through a rugged canyon and across many arroyos, but it is our most direct access to Highway 60, and our only access to Highway 60 when mud renders our only other access road, B-127, impassable. In essence, it is our lifeline, and it cannot be jeopardized by increased usage from transmission line construction and maintenance activities, nor can it be closed at any time during construction of a transmission line without jeopardizing the livelihoods and safety of the local residents.</li> </ol>	
1200	<p>I urge your group to recommend the Tucson Corridor for the Sun Zia high power transmission lines. Reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The Tucson Corridor is already in use and further carrying capacity is in progress being paid for by TEP. SunZIA could join in and share expenses and profits in further developing already disturbed areas.</li> <li>2. I urge your group to recommend protection of the Aravaipa Corridor from disturbance due to the construction of the Sun Zia high power transmission lines which will encourage roads and/or wildcat roads over State Trust and Federal National Forest lands.</li> </ol>	
1207	<p>If anyone is reading this, imagine a 10 foot corridor through your backyard that has ugly poles and high voltage electric lines and is available for anyone to run their ATVs at any hour and use that corridor as egress to the rest of your backyard.</p>	
1264	<p>I oppose erecting power transmission lines through sensitive wilderness areas such as Aravaipa and the San Pedro River valley. These are the</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>only remaining riparian wilderness areas in Southern Arizona, and the proposed project will destroy them.</p> <p>It does not matter how many precautions the designers and builders take. The project will encourage development of roads, off-road vehicle intrusions, and completely unnecessary "development" into these areas, which can only result in the disruption of active wildlife corridors and highly complex and sensitive ecosystems.</p>	
1279	<p>Not only would the construction and presence of the power lines cause substantial disturbance in itself, but it would open a much easier path for subsequent destruction such as that which would be used by ATVs. Such traffic would be unavoidable once the access road and clearing that would necessarily accompany the power lines are built. Humans who currently have access to this area by backpacking, tend to have a much greater respect for and a much lower impact on nature than those who might gain entry on motorized vehicles. Once desecrated, it will be much more difficult to successfully oppose further development and roads in the area, and other pristine wilderness area and much of its fauna will be lost.</p>	
1308	<p>Integral to the unfragmented and open space character of the MSPRV is the lack of improved roads. The MSPRV is in fact part of one of the largest "roadless areas" in the American Southwest. "Roadless area" is a technical term that means, "Literally an area without any improved [author's emphasis] roads maintained for travel by standard passenger type vehicles. The Cascabel/Redington road within the MSPRV routes proposed by SunZia does not meet that criterion. The U.S. Department of Interior classifies a road that "May or may not be graded, and has a dirt surface of any width" as an "Unimproved Road: J3 though Cochise County classifies it merely as a "primitive road." With only a few exceptions around the margins, the area is predominantly "roadless" from the western flanks of the Rincon Mountains and crest of the Catalina Mountains to San Manuel and highway 77, then to the Gila River on the north, to the town of Bonita on the east, and to Three Links Road on the south. That area includes not only the MSPRV and its ranges, but also portions of the Lower SPRY, the Santa Teresa Mountains, and most of the Aravaipa Valley and the Pinaleno Mountains. ...wildlife connections... extend from the San Carlos Reservation south through the Aravaipa and Santa Teresa Wilderness Areas, and then further south into the wilderness land of the Galiuro Mountains. There exists a 100-mile-long stretch of land, extending from the San Carlos Apache Reservation all the way south through Gila, Pinal, and Graham Counties to northern Cochise County, containing a network of wildlife trails that has never been interrupted by a motorized vehicle road, one of the last remaining Wildlife migration corridors of this type and magnitude in the Southwest.</p> <p>Indeed, the MSPRV is part of a largely unfragmented area of nearly one million acres. It may be objected that the areal extent here considered is already fragmented by a natural gas pipeline, an electric transmission line and service roads, and ranch roads. In that regard, the point here is not that the MSPRV is "pristine" and without scars, but rather that it is "largely unfragmented and intact." The pipeline and existing power line</p>	Cascabel Working Group

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>roads have indeed left significant erosive scars, introduced exotic species, and permitted greater ORV trespass, all points that will be examined below in greater detail as significant direct impacts of the proposed SunZia project Ranch roads on the other hand typically follow washes and ridges and do not cut transvalley swaths to steep high points. The SunZia project however, with its twin 16-story 500Kv towers and access roads along the full length of the valley foothills, is enormously greater in its scope and projected impact than anything existing in the valley. That is not to mention the expansion to other infrastructure projects along the same corridor that are clearly foreseen by SunZia's FERC application. The SunZia project is to the existing power lines what an Interstate Highway would be to the Cascabel/Redington unimproved dirt road. Were it implemented, the appellation for the Middle SPRV would have to be altered to "largely fragmented," and prospects for some larger conservation status for the valley would be greatly imperiled if not fatal.</p>	
1316	<p>I am writing today to let you know that it is not acceptable to sacrifice our wilderness areas in order to meet the energy needs of the large urban growth centers, that it is not acceptable to introduce a new major infrastructure corridor that will bisect and eventually fragment the wildlife connections that extend from the San Carlos Reservation south through the Aravaipa and Santa Teresa Wilderness Areas, and then further south into the wilderness land of the Galiuro Mountains. There exists a 100-mile-long stretch of land, extending from the San Carlos Apache Reservation all the way south through Gila, Pinal, and Graham Counties to northern Cochise County, containing a network of wildlife trails that has never been interrupted by a motorized vehicle road, one of the last remaining wildlife migration corridors of this type and magnitude in the Southwest. This project would open the gates to human development by setting a major precedent for disturbing the wild and open country of the Galiuros. It would open pristine areas to motorized "off-highway" traffic, and eventually degrade the ecosystem to the point that highways, freeways, and associated development will no longer seem like such an impact. We've seen this trend time after time in history, enough to recognize that underregulated growth, like cancer, will continually expand its network of supply lines to feed major growth centers, eventually destroying the host.</p>	
1338	<p>Minimize roads, fences, and other infrastructure. BLM should consider the option of requiring construction of underground transmission lines where proposed rights-of-way conflict with sensitive biological resources, and where conflicts with military activities may reduce the feasibility of environmentally preferable routes.</p>	Audubon New Mexico
1353	<p>The proposed route would block the road-less wildlife migration corridor between the Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness and the Galiuro Wilderness in the Coronado National Forest, one of the last of this magnitude in the southwest. The importance of this 100-mile long corridor has not been taken into account because for some unknown reason the study area stops just north of the Galiuros and does not include the road-less areas to the north. This is an essential corridor for many animals, such as desert bighorn sheep, black bears, mountain</p>	Aravaipa Property Owners Association

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>lions, and mule deer, and it connects these two ecologically pristine areas. Overall, approximately 50 miles of the proposed route would pass through or within one mile of areas determined to be environmentally sensitive, the largest number of miles in this category of all the transmission line routes, proposed or alternative. More importantly, once the transmission lines are in place with their attendant maintenance access, they will act like a “gateway drug” to further access, first by off-road vehicles, then to more development and degradation.</p>	
1360	<p>Please consider the following points in determining the location of your power lines. We live in Redington, west of the river. We are 3rd and 4th generation landowners here. The San Pedro Valley is a rarity as is Aravaipa.</p> <p>-Service roads will encourage remote ATV access and subsequent abuses of both the vegetation and the considerable cultural and historic resources found in the valley.</p> <p>-Access roads would provide opportunities for illegal dumping of rubbish.</p>	
1381	<p>Construction of a large transmission line involves developing temporary construction roads as well as a permanent road under the line. This causes significant habitat fragmentation and invites off-road vehicles. Roads and motorized uses can have serious detrimental effects on habitats and wildlife. These effects include direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts, ranging from mortality from collisions with vehicles, modification of animal behaviors, altered use of habitats, facilitation of the spread of exotic, invasive, and parasitic species, adverse genetic effects, and fragmentation of connected habitats.</p> <p>Further road-building, construction, and improved off-road vehicle access in this area will also contribute to erosion and sedimentation that could travel downstream through tributaries and impact threatened native fish populations and other species in Aravaipa Canyon, over 20 of which are designated with some sort of special status.</p> <p>A transmission project of the size proposed by SunZia and its related construction and maintenance access routes will greatly increase unauthorized traffic in the area which will also increase the risk of looting and vandalism to these prehistoric sites.</p>	Sierra Club et. al.
1399	<p>Other issues that will be of vital interest to us, the property owners, is who is going to monitor the huge influx of subcontractors who will be moving fences, spooking cattle and wildlife, to make sure that no trespassers who wish to destroy property are allowed access to the property?</p>	Anam Inc./Willow Springs Ranch (AZ)
<b>CODE 046.00 Military Considerations</b>		
884	<p>I do not believe the new proposals address the issues of a river crossing between Bosque del Apache and Belen. Any crossing must be underground to preserve the integrity of the daily flight paths of sandhill cranes and migratory routes for other birds. Routes adjacent to Belen still mar the landscape/viewscape as they come past Socorro and San Antonio. Any new lines between San Antonio and Belen will damage</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	our already struggling farmers and our ecotourisms base that is inherently tied to our open spaces and beautiful scenery. The only acceptable routes remain those that run along the borders of White Sands and cross the river south of the Bosque del Apache.	
892	Regarding sections A60, A90, and A80 – these proposed lines are within 3 miles of our headquarters/homes. My children are the 5th generation in my family to live on this ranch. We have approximately 1,200 acres of deeded land and I will not consider any easements or right of ways on my property. We border an environmental study area, so I see the reason to avoid that area. Frequently, Air Force jets and helicopters fly over the ranch, sometimes at about 40-50 ft altitude. We do have desert tortoise on the ranch. Not sure what category they fall into. Please consider running lines east of Missile Range.	
900	I do not want this power line to pass through Bingham to San Antonio, NM (A80/A60). First of all, New Mexico residents receive no benefit by allowing SunZia to install 200 ft per line, 1000 ft for 2 lines, 130 to 160 feet high, 1300-1500 feet between structures on BLM, wildlife refuge, private deeded land north or south of Hwy 380 or Rt. 525 to Stallion Range Center (WSMR) in order to provide urban/suburban areas of Phoenix, AZ with power to fuel their energy demands. As a private landowner I resist the implication of installation of these powerlines on wildlife, ranchers, Indian artifacts, WSMR airspace, scenic beauty, disruption of the ecosystem in the fragile desert climate to hawks, antelope, cattle, jackrabbits, snakes, etc.	
902	I appreciate that BLM considered a 3rd scoping meeting to review the transmission routes put forth by the military, BLM, Fish and Wildlife. This additional northern route reduces the impact of the transmission line to the mission the regional military installations (WSMR, Kirtland, Cannon AFB, Holloman AFB, and Ft. Bliss). This northern route should allow for the testing and training that is currently taking place (and that is being planned for this area) to continue on track. The economic activity of this work is vital, not only to the state of NM, but also to the communities that serve these military bases. These missions are vital to the nation and we are constantly reminded that encroachment to the bases could have a negative impact on future missions. The northern route minimizes the encroachment impact from all the other alternatives.	New Mexico Military Base Planning Commissioner
959	All of our friends in Socorro, San Antonio, and at the Bosque favor locating the mile wide transmission corridor at the southern end of the White Sands Missile Range.	
965	Place the power lines away from the bird traveling corridors PLEASE! New Mexico has plenty of OTHER LAND. Run it across some of the millions of acres of empty military lands BUT Please Don't Mess With The Bird Flight Corridors.	
985	[W]e're on the north end of the area for the White Sands Missile Range northern area, and we're on County Road 121. And by looking at these maps, the proposed line at E80 would come right – it's E80 100 turns, it goes right between our house and the optic site, or right close to the optic site that we have a contract with the Army for the optics for L94,	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>LC94, which is the proposed well, it's the launching pad for the missile. And then we have the optic site. They're on two sites so they can get triangulation. So we would like to see that thing – if they are going propose, it put it in that area, we understand; but we would like to see it go north of the LC optic and north of our house and north of John Sais, S-A-I-S. Because talking to the Army people, if we run it farther south that will become unusable to the Army. So we'd lose or contract with them, and that's quite a bit of money. But if they could put it north, that would be fine.</p>	
991	<p>Not in my backyard – please! I am especially concerned about wildlife – the bird flyways that will be affected. We have "lost" the Whooping Cranes to man's "needs" for erecting wires – let's not lose anymore birds. I'm also concerned about the effects on the health of people who live under/near these powerlines. Surely the proposal to follow the White Sands' western fence line makes more sense related to the impact on people and animals.</p>	
1002	<p>For 55 years there have been White Sands Missile Range Contracts and Evacuation Contracts on the land that now comprises Boyd Ranch (and others). It has been important to our national defense program and we have been proud to be a part of that. In addition the consideration for the contract made dry land ranching possible and is a factor considered when buying and selling ranches in this area and was a consideration in our purchasing the ranch. Because of the lines, White Sands will remove this northern part from the contracts which will be costly to us (around \$25,000 a year), and it is a loss for which we will not be compensated. It is not a resource a potential buyer can consider.</p> <p>SunZia initially said that it would ~trive to place the transmission lines where there power lines rights of way, roads and other intrusions into the land already exist. Route E-80 through our ranch is the route being studied that crosses more virgin unspoiled pristine public lands than any other route. The southern route along Interstate 10 is the logical place to locate the lines. If should go along outside the east boundary of the White Sands Missile Range and then follow Interstate 10.</p>	
1007	<p>First, ranchers in this valley have contracts with the US Army for their use of our airspace. Our area is called the Northern Extension of White Sands Missile Range. Our agreement with the Army is to evacuate our ranch when there is a missile firing, which gives the army a clear field for their operations, such as missile reentry. The proposed lines through the Northern Extension place at risk these contracts which provide a critical service to the Department of Defense.</p> <p>It seems contradictory to place an electric power line through these airspaces that would be at risk of interruption by the Army's activities, when we are required by contract to leave our homes for these same activities.</p>	
1036	<p>I specifically recommend Route numbers A 181 and A300 (or alternately, A250) as the Proposed Route for the SunZia DEIS. It is wisest to follow a path cutting diagonally west-southwest from the new sub-station. then skirting past the northwest corner of White Sands</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>Missile Range property just south of Highway 380, and turning immediately south, following the WSMR boundary to the point where the line must head west in order to cross the Rio Grande just south of Arrey, NM. Here are the reasons I request this route:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It avoids all NWRs, WSAs, WAs, ACECs, and conservation easements.</li> <li>• It avoids relatively populated agricultural and scenic areas.</li> <li>• It avoids the low-altitude migratory avian flyway through Rio bosques.</li> <li>• This eastern-end route is shortest, causing the least land disturbance.</li> </ul> <p>I understand the military is finally ready to accept the proximity of the powerline following outside their west boundary. Thus, let us utilize this opportunity and option.</p>	
1067	<p>On behalf of the Friends of the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge, and as a citizen who lives in the flyway, I would like to convey our opposition to the proposed study area expansion, as it does not provide any new routes that would relieve our concerns regarding the wildlife and economy of our community. Routes with valley crossings between Socorro and Belen would still pose a hazard to the daily flight patterns of sandhill cranes and snow geese, as well as the migratory pathway for hundreds of thousands of other birds. The infrastructure for this transmission corridor will mar the landscape and be visible for many miles in the open Vistas of the Middle Rio Grande Valley.</p> <p>Though population densities are low between Socorro and Belen, tourism and land values are tied to the unique views of the rolling hills of Sevilleta National Wildlife Refuge, the majesty of "M" Mountain, and the cottonwood gallery along the Rio Grande. In concurrence with the position of the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge and many others in the community, the Friends believe that an eastern route, preferably along the eastern boundary of White Sands, is the only feasible option.</p>	
1078	<p>Concerning the proposed route for SunZia's powerline across the northern ends of Socorro and Polvadera, I strongly urge you to reconsider the corridor proposed in SunZia's original 2008 filing, which follows White Sand's western fence line. I agree with the Fish and Wildlife Service that this western boundary route is the most reasonable in that it protects wildlife along the Rio Grande flyway and has the least impact on our communities.</p>	
1146	<p>One of the possible routes you have proposed for the SunZia 500 KV power lines passes through San Acacia, Polvadera, and/or Lemitar in Socorro County. I strongly object to your using this corridor and ask that you use one of your alternate corridors instead. All things considered, the corridor(s) along White Sands would seem to be far better alternatives.</p> <p>My objection is based on (1) scientific evidence indicating possible links between EMFs and childhood leukemia, fibromyalgia, Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's, migraine headaches, sleep disorders, allergies, and asthma; (2) degradation of local property values because of potential buyers' concerns about health, neighborhood aesthetics, quality of life</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	and diminished resale value; (3) possible negative effects on the migratory, reproductive and nesting behavior of the tens (hundreds?) of thousands of birds which migrate here annually; and (4) associated negative effects on the birdcentered tourist industry in the City of Socorro, the Bosque del Apache and surrounding communities.	
1156	I still favor the more expensive route, that is, more expensive to the SunZia group, of Winchester to Vail through Tucson via steel towers instead of lattice towers. This right-of-way can be accomplished in a way that will make more "sense". I also want to say that I do not believe that the DOD and Ft. Huachuca are intensely against this route. This is an easy way out for EPG and their consultants concerning this proposed route: the military, our government, seriously opposes it so what can we do but go a different way?	
1181	<p>BLM Should Continue Coordination with the Department of Defense Military readiness, healthy natural resources, and the development of renewable energy are all essential to our national interests. Therefore, BLM should continue coordination with the Department of Defense (DOD) to identify potential siting and mitigation solutions that could minimize impacts to the environment while also minimizing impacts to military missions. It is our understanding that some of the routes which appear to have the least environmental impacts have raised concern at some local military installations because of potential impacts to their mission.</p> <p>There are significant opportunities for collaboration and compromise with DOD, as detailed in Attachment A. Thorough analysis of potential mitigation opportunities is critical to define what the true impacts of SunZia will have on military missions. Renewable energy generation and transmission projects across the west are facing challenges with potential impacts to DOD, and BLM should proactively work with all stakeholders to identify solutions for individual projects as well establishing better coordination at the programmatic level.</p> <p>Recommendation: BLM should continue coordination with DOD to identify potential siting and mitigation solutions that could minimize impacts to the environment while also minimizing impacts to military missions.</p>	The Wilderness Society et. al.
1255	Before identifying the preferred alternative for the transmission corridor, a thorough analysis of the visual resource impacts to White Sands NM from the proposed eastern corridors should be conducted.	National Parks Conservation Association
1263	I am writing because I want the Bosque del Apache protected from any impact from the SunZia transmission project. The Bosque is on the flyway used by 60,000 ducks, 20,000 cranes, and 40,000 geese. The Bosque is a precious treasure to save for us and future generations. The Bosque del Apache also contributes to the economic vitality of Socorro and the surrounding communities. I prefer that the transmission line route be located on the east side of White Sands Missile Range and continue south to Fort Bliss. My second preference is for the power line to cross at Derry-Arrey and follow the northwest boundary of the White Sands Missile Range and head east at Highway 380. Please protect our	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	wildlife!	
1267	<p>Red Doc Farm is composed of Roland K. Sanchez, MD, Elia Sanchez, Jessica Sanchez, MD, Alicia Sanchez, M.S. Adolfo Sanchez, MD, Roland Sanchez II DDS, Florian Sanchez, 4th year Vet Student and Emilio Sanchez senior at Texas Tech – Animal Science. Red Doc Farm is currently renting 27 sections from Joan Donaldson, Donaldson Ranch.</p> <p>We are strongly opposed to one of the proposed routes for NM Sun Zia Project for the new electrical transmission lines from Corona, New Mexico through this pristine property for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. The economic effect on this Ranch and the historic Ranches that surround this Ranch. These Ranches depend on contracts with the White Sands Missile Range to provide air space for military aircrafts and missile experiments. This threatens these contracts.</p> <p>5. We are asking that another route be found due to the economic, medical, and pasture concerns and the preservation of this pristine, untouched conglomerate of land with many third and fourth generation Ranchers trying to preserve a land and way of life. We strive to preserve this so that others may share this beauty. We ask who is New Mexico Sun Zia? Do they have a contingency for compensation to those with medical effects and compensation to the Rancher for their economic loss due to their lines?</p>	
1268	<p>Recommendation on continued coordination with the Department of Defense to identify potential siting and mitigation solutions that could minimize impacts to the environment while also minimizing impacts to military missions.</p>	<p>Empire-Fagan Coalition</p>
1322	<p>Following are my comments and questions on the proposed Sun Zia transmission project.</p> <p>Impact on the Extension Area of WSMR. I am particularly concerned with the route proposed as E80, E90 &amp; E100.</p> <p>These sections pass between the launch site known as LC94 and the radar and optics sites. This site was the initial research and testing to improve the patriot missile that was used last year to destroy a de-orbiting satellite with pinpoint accuracy. What impact will the power line have on the communications needed to operate the launch site? Would it force WSMR to shut down the facility? What mitigating measures could be taken to alleviate the interference? This same area is also used for night flights by helicopters flying from Kirtland Air Force Base to WSMR for training exercises. Would the magnetic field from the line interfere with the electronics on the helicopters? Also these flights are low flying. Would the line pass a physical danger and what could be done to mitigate that danger?</p> <p>There is another site within two miles of the proposed line that is called ATACMS. This is an impact site for testing an anti-personnel missile. What impact would the line have on this site? There is also a no fly zone in effect over this area. Since I anticipate construction by helicopter and also maintenance, how would that be handled with WSMR as far as scheduling?</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>Financial Impact</p> <p>From the aspect of national defense, what would be the cost to WSMR if the LC94 site had to be closed? If it rendered the Kirtland missions inoperable, what would be the cost to find another suitable site? The ranchers in the extension area of WSMR also have contracts with the range both for the sites and possible impacts from stray missiles from the main missile range. If the power line causes WSMR to cancel or alter those contracts, what compensation would we expect?</p> <p>President Roosevelt set aside Bosque del Apache as a sanctuary for migratory wildlife in 1935. I can not believe that anyone or any group would propose or even consider a transmission project that would destroy 75 years of work by man to protect the migratory wildlife. I agree with Bosque del Apache that an eastern route through the edge of White Sands is a more feasible route for the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project.</p>	
1326	<p>I am completely opposed to the idea of putting high-power lines over the Rio Grande anywhere near Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge. The most logical and least expensive alternative is to cross the river somewhere between Hatch and Las Cruces where in some areas the river runs narrowly between two high bluffs. From there the lines should run north close to the San Andres mountains and west of the White Sands Missile Range. This is a situation where the U.S. Military establishment really needs to cooperate so that renewable power from wind and solar installations in eastern New Mexico can be delivered efficiently and at minimal cost to the population centers in Arizona.</p>	
1328	<p>The MVAS fully supports the development of alternative energy sources such as wind, geothermal and solar for a more sustainable future. However, it must be done in an ecologically friendly manner, otherwise it defeats the purpose. More of the energy generation from these sources should be done at the point of use. For example, on the roof tops of buildings and covered parking lots both public and private thus reducing the need for as many long distance transmission lines. The SunZia transmission line and the windmills associated with it must not degrade the land (especially public land) or the wildlife that live on it.</p> <p>If the powerline must be built then the best route would be as far away from sensitive wildlife habitat and the Rio Grande as possible. Riparian habitats are among the most productive and ecologically diverse habitats in North America. They provide the essential food and water for numerous species of migratory birds and other species. These same riparian habitats have suffered the greatest losses due to human development and are among the most endangered habitats in North America. The Rio Grande is the major north/south bird migration corridor in the western United States. Powerlines are notorious for killing and injuring birds, therefore the placement of this powerline is extremely important. Current science seems to indicate that the best location for the powerline is to run around the east side of White Sands Missile Range.</p>	Mesilla Valley Audubon Society (MVAS)

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1338	<p>Recommended Route</p> <p>Based on current knowledge, the route with the least environmental impacts is the route around the east side of the White Sands Missile Range in New Mexico. In areas where restrictions on air space from military activities would preclude construction of above-ground power and transmission lines, lines should be buried. This eastern route also eliminates environmental impacts to annual spring and fall migration of cranes, waterfowl, shorebirds through the Las Uvas Valley. If subsequent environmental analysis confirms that this route will have the least environmental impacts, BLM should select this route.</p>	Audubon New Mexico
1343	<p>Developing renewable sources of energy is critical to mitigating the impacts that a warming climate is having on our wildlife. The infrastructure for renewable energy, however, like the proposed SunZia transmission lines, must be sited in a way that won't negatively impact the wildlife. It would be incredibly shortsighted to address one threat to wildlife while creating yet another.</p> <p>The Rio Grande may be the most important wildlife corridor in New Mexico. Many species of birds and butterflies migrate hundreds and thousands of miles up and down the Rio Grande. The Rio Grande and other important wildlife corridors in New Mexico are becoming increasingly fragmented and the NMWF along with many other agencies and organizations is committed to better understanding, documenting and protecting these corridors. Transmission lines crossing the Rio Grande will undoubtedly have significant impacts to migrating bird populations and other wildlife because they will physically bifurcate this passageway. Sandhill Cranes, waterfowl and other migrating birds could be deterred or snared by these lines strung across this corridor that has been in use since time immemorial. The electromagnetic field emanating from these lines may have additional impacts to wildlife. For these reasons, all the proposed crossings of the Rio Grande are problematic, especially the proposed route crossing at Highway 380 just north of Bosque del Apache. In our opinion, the best route for the SunZia line is on the east side of White Sands Missile Range.</p> <p>BLM should require construction of underground transmission lines where proposed rights-of-way conflict with sensitive biological resources and military activities.</p>	New Mexico Wildlife Federation
1346	<p>[W]e are absolutely opposed to the "Study Area Expansion April 2010". Referencing your maps dated April 23,2010, from the proposed SunZia-East Substation to the San Antonio area turning-point-south, we request that both northerly proposed routes known as "E10" and "E80" (in the expansion study) and route "A50-60-90" (in the original study) be removed from further consideration.</p> <p>After some research, we are fully aware of the financial commitment to an underground system. However, in urban and more congested environments as well as in national parks, underground transmission systems are well at work. Since the year 2000, in places such as Massachusetts, New York, California, and Puerto Rico, Burns and McDonnell, a prominent U.S. based electrical engineering consultant and construction firm, has successfully finished miles and miles of</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	underground transmission lines to improve the lives of the respective area residents and lessen the impact on local environments. If 25 miles of transmission line can be buried in San Juan, Puerto Rico, then 50 miles across the northern borders of White Sands Missile Range and Bosque Del Apache is also very possible.	
1372	I would like to convey my opposition to the proposed study area expansion, due to concerns regarding the wildlife. I am an avid birder and love Bosque del Apache. I understand that the current proposed route would create hazards for the sandhill cranes and snow geese who winter there and for hundreds of thousands of migratory birds. In concurrence with the position of the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge and many others in the community, an eastern route, preferably along the eastern boundary of White Sands, is the only feasible option.	
1374	These considerations suggest that a route to the east of White Sands Missile Range and the mountains parallel to the Rio Grande River, yet one west of the Pecos Valley. If there are conflicts in some of this area with military activities, the line should be buried in those areas of conflict as well.	Sangre de Cristo Audubon Society
1381	Route with Least Environmental Conflicts in New Mexico We recommend analyzing the D10/D61/D62/D100/D101/D104 route through Carrizozo and on the east side of the White Sands Missile Range (WSMR), as it contains the least conflicts with environmentally sensitive areas and designated or proposed conservation lands. We suggest that you also analyze an alternative route on the east side of WSMR as proposed in comments submitted by The Wilderness Society and partners (November 25, 2009). We advocate for analysis of a route that crosses the Rio Grande River south of the Caballo Reservoir between Derry and Arrey. We request that the physical and economic feasibility of undergrounding the transmission line across the Rio Grande riparian area be analyzed.	Sierra Club et. al.
1389	I sent these comments to Senator Bingaman on April 30, 2010. He just advised me to direct them to the local BLM. I hope I am still within the comment period.  Dear Senator Bingaman: I am opposed to the Sun Zia Transmission Lines. At our recent Lincoln County Commission meeting, I learned that these will be a "oneway" highway, probably DC current, with one entry port and one offramp. No chance for other power sources to add along the way. The power delivered to AZ and CA will be very expensive.  I am also very concerned with the interference with Holloman Air Base Training. It was only 3 years ago that we were fighting to keep all of our air bases in NM with the promise of wide open spaces and unobstructed areas for training. All of the bases have had new missions and expanded the training and population. Now we want to compromise this with the Sun Zia line. Absolutely not. Although the wind energy around Corona will benefit a few landowners, it will be a detriment to many others and our national security.	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1401	Fort Bliss supports the inclusion and evaluation of the alternate routes in the Environmental Impact Statement being prepared by BLM. The proposed routes in Lincoln, Torrance, Valencia, and Socorro Counties could potentially minimize detrimental impacts to training and operations at Fort Bliss and other military installations in New Mexico.	Ft. Bliss
<b>CODE 050.00 Scenic/Visual/Landscape Character</b>		
882	Route E110 along the S border of Sevilleta NWR seems to run directly down San Lorenzo Canyon. Any route in this area needs to be farther south a bit to save this scenic canyon.	
896	A-130 and A-140 routes run right by my house and farm. This power line would be eye sore and devalue property value and make it difficult to sell.	
897	We own a 40-acre farm in San Antonio – along the A-130 and A-140 proposed route. We built a two-story Victorian house and running those horrible power lines near my home will definitely destroy the view. We put the propane tank in back and buried the electrical lines to keep the Victorian house looking aged and in that period.	
899	Socorro County is the second poorest county in NM. It's primary source of income (besides employees at Stallion) is generated by ecotourism. People come here to enjoy the vast scenic vistas.	
908	<p>Proposed segment C276 would deface the central scenic focus of the Cascabel community – the set of cliffs along the west side of the San Pedro River. The cliffs have the following significance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unique spectacular scenery – unique in the San Pedro Valley/riddled with attractive slot canyons.</li> <li>2. Geology – the cliffs exist because of the interaction of ancient hot spring systems with basin-fill sediments. The sediments have been re-cemented and hardened by the hot water.</li> <li>3. Biology – the micro environments at the foot of the cliffs host a set of species not seen elsewhere at similar altitude.</li> <li>4. Community importance – the cliffs are a central focus point for the Cascabel community. In addition, the more spectacular slot canyons are of spiritual significance to many residents.</li> </ol> <p>I do not understand why areas of "visual resource" significance are shown north of C276. The segment cuts right through the areas that are visually significant to the Cascabel community. This and other segment need to be designed with a view the sensitivity of local communities.</p>	
915	The Galiuro wilderness, in combination with the San Pedro, creates such a beautiful valley that to touch it would be such a shame. We need areas to get away from the works of man and get back to nature. Continued development and projects such as this are a major threat to that.	
920	While it is necessary to have powerlines to transmit electricity from any source, including renewable energy, I must express my concern over any route that follows the CAP canal or that bisects or skirst the Tucson	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>Mitigation Corridor. There is already too much going on in the Avra Valley that negatively impacts the ability of wildlife to cross from the Tucson Mtns to the mountain ranges further west, specifically the CAP canal and CAP recharge ponds. Besides the sensitivity regarding wildlife migration, there is the concern over the damage to the landscape (both visual as well as physical.) There are too many beautiful parks in the Avra Valley that would suffer from the construction of a 1000-ft corridor ad all the huge, unsightly towers. Why not construct more substations using smaller lines, or using existing corridors?</p>	
927	<p>RE: alternative routes proposed for the SunZia SWTP in southern Arizona should follow routes that have been already compromised by infrastructure. It is inconceivable that a route is being considered that invades two well-visited Nation Parks, ie., as in F100, F104, F350, F410, F400. Additionally, the nationally recognized Desert Museum is the (after the Grand Canyon) second most visited spot in Arizona. Its viewshed will be destroyed as will be the view from Gates Pass. It is also clear that the SW area heavily populated with poor and elderly populations will be highly impacted.</p>	
954	<p>My wife and I are very concerned that the transmission line will be pushed through because \$\$\$ talk. Talking of which, to destroy the beauty of the Sonoran Desert in this region is a sacrilege. Desert Museum, Tucson Studios, Saguaro National Park, Tucson Mountain Park are just a few of the things that make this area special and the choice of millions of visitors per year. Not to see power lines.</p>	
955	<p>And I have a really specific thing I want to address, that is the Segment No. C276 which cuts across the San Pedro River right in the Casterville community. The proposed route for that is very problematic to me and other people in the community because it carves up one of the principal scenic focuses of the community.</p> <p>There's a set of rather spectacular cliffs that the river has cut into the basin filled sediments, west side of the river and east side. The sediment goes straight up the cliffs, so t hey put a road up the cliffs. It's what you see as sort of the principal identifying feature of that area as you drive through Casterville.</p> <p>Scenically, it 's unique through the San Pedro River. There are very few places where the river cuts high cliffs like that into the valley sediments.</p>	
956	<p>I live in the Avra Valley and operate a vacation rental on 10 acres of beautiful desert. I have heard that there are plans to put a power line up the Avra Valley. This is a very troubling proposal and I am totally opposed to it. Not only would it be a major disruption to our views, but it would have a damaging impact on my rental property business. Guests constantly remark on the sunset views to the west, the sunrise over the Tucson Mountains and the general sense of quiet beauty on the western slopes of the Tucson Mountains. The Arizona Sonora Desert Museum is located here for a reason – the unspoiled beauty of this area. Please do not destroy this unique desert habitat. Use existing routes for power transmission, don't spoil more desert.</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
961	<p>We are writing concerning the project of yours that is proposed to go right thru the center of Windmill Ranch. When we bought our property 7 years ago we thought we were buying a place that was quiet, natural and would be conserved for all to enjoy.</p> <p>If your company puts a huge power line thru the property all of that beauty will be gone. We do not understand how a company would want to do that. We realize that at the moment the ranch just looks like pretty much vacant land but there are many property owners and your plan will change the entire ranch forever. Could you please not do this.</p>	
982	<p>I live probably less than a quarter mile or about a quarter mile north of one of the proposed lines just north of San Antonio. It cuts right across. Someone went with them when they were showing the proposed line exactly where it would go through, called and told me, "That's like right out your windows," south of the hay barn by my house, one thing of the many things I'm concerned about. Well, the most obvious is the horrific ugly monstrosity looking things that go marching throughout the valley. Arizona has its own wind. Let them, you know, produce their own wind energy. It's not green when you've got to march it cross the states. I'm just upset about it. I don't want to see it happen. The atrocious look of the landscape, once beautiful landscape, in Arizona is all anybody needs see, with these horrible looking structures crisscrossing the country over there. It's – there's nothing good about it, and it's not going benefit our state. It's just going to scar it in many ways.</p>	
983	<p>The two routes we saw that we really like are E10 and E80. And E10 is the most preferable. There's one route that could be quite detrimental to the views for where we live, and that is D10, David-10.</p>	
986	<p>And probably one that you've heard before is the visual wall of the line with possible especially, if the alternative turned out to be along the Rio Grande corridor – if the transmission line could be at ground level or below grade, that would be preferable to an aerial line, just because of visual impacts.</p>	
1002	<p>The E-80 route on the proposed SunZia Transmission Project crosses our New Mexico Grazing Leases GM 3065, GO 1550, and GO 1191 and comes very close to our house and the ranch headquarters on fee simple land.</p> <p>Even after construction the presence of the lines may interfere with the use. The pristine natural beauty and unspoiled nature and unencumbered views of the ranch were a point of appeal for us when we bought it and were expected to be a point of appeal in the event we were to offer the ranch for sale. The presence of those lines (and the expectation of more to be built) will lower appraisals for refinancing or for a sale transaction. The new ranch house was built with view to the pristine virgin land that was expected never to be developed because it was state trust land. The lines will ruin our view shed because they will run about a quarter of a mile from the house and the ranch headquarters on a very visible ridge.</p>	
1009	<p>I would not want these high voltage towers routed through our town of Mescal or J-6. These towers will make our neighborhood look like an</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	industrial zone and will hurt residential property values. I suggest an alternate route along highway 40 or along remote railroad tracks, but not through AZ towns or cities. Since AZ residents will not benefit from this transfer of electricity, neither should residents have to suffer by having these ugly towers in our backyards.	
1013	I would like to go on record as opposing the proposed study area expansion of the power transmission corridor. The Middle Rio Grande valley is a rural area that is, as yet, unmarred by massive power lines. We are fortunate to still have an environment that is conducive to migratory birds and other wildlife. There is no benefit to local landowners.	
1015	My wife and I purchased property in Deer Canyon near Mountain, NM. This project appears to invade that area. We never would have purchased if this project was known. It will substantially decrease our property value. The project appears to be close proximity to Abo and Grana Quivira part of Salinas, NM. The appearance will be a further scar of modern society and a sign of disrespect for our American heritage. I respectfully request that the expansion area avoid these areas.	
1025	I am an Arizona native from Tucson, and have recently bought land in High Point Ranch 8 Miles south of Klondyke, AZ. There are approx 66 sections of land with no water, electric, gas, or phone lines to the properties, and minimal traffic. We do not organize as a homeowner association until June 19, 2010, so you have not heard from approx 66 new land owners about our views on a by way with tall transmission towers, road construction, possible dense housing for the workers and all of the new businesses that would follow, just to bring power from New Mexico to Casa Grande to benefit California, Utah, Las Vegas, etc. This cheap land is pristine and has always since the 1800's been very sparsely populated and should be for many reasons – for Indian sites, riparian areas, clean air, little crime, dark skies, for astronomy.	
1047	<p>The mandate of the National Park Service is to preserve and protect the scenery, and natural and cultural resources of park lands for the enjoyment of the American public, and to leave them unimpaired to be enjoyed by future generations (16 USC 1-4). The "scenery," includes the natural viewshed, as well as the landscape. The scenery of a national park, like air, water or wildlife, is a valuable resource that can easily be degraded or destroyed by surrounding development. In addition, both districts of the park contain substantial designated Wilderness areas, comprising over 78% of the park's total acreage. According to the Wilderness Act, areas with this designation must be managed in their primitive condition, where "the impact of man's work [is] substantially unnoticeable." Location of the transmission lines adjacent to either unit of the park would have significant negative impacts to both the park's viewshed and its Wilderness Character.</p> <p>Saguaro National Park receives over 700,000 visitors to the park each year from all over the world, generating over \$23 million in visitor spending. In combination with the Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum and Pima County's Tucson Mountain Park west of Interstate 10, millions of visitors and citizens rely on these areas for rest, recreation, solace, and</p>	National Park Service – Saguaro

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>education about our unique Sonoran Desert resources. We cannot afford to alter this landscape.</p> <p>We respectfully request that the potential corridors shown west of the park's west boundary, as well as the potential San Pedro River Valley corridor east of the park's east boundary, be removed from consideration. We support either the No Action alternative, or location of the transmission lines well north of the city of Tucson, bypassing the city altogether.</p> <p>Saguaro National Park would like to keep apprised of this project.</p>	
1067	<p>Though population densities are low between Socorro and Belen, tourism and land values are tied to the unique views of the rolling hills of Sevilleta National Wildlife Refuge, the majesty of "M" Mountain, and the cottonwood gallery along the Rio Grande. In concurrence with the position of the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge and many others in the community, the Friends believe that an eastern route, preferably along the eastern boundary of White Sands, is the only feasible option.</p>	
1148	<p>I am also concerned about the obvious decimation of property values, owing to the fact that many people who might otherwise buy homes in this area would not do so if these high voltage lines were nearby, given concerns about health, aesthetics, quality of life and resale value.</p> <p>For these reasons, I strongly object to locating power lines in the above-mentioned corridor and ask that you choose some alternate route that does not have such negative effects on the human and animal populations. The corridors bordering White Sands would seem to be a much better alternative.</p>	
1153	<p>Please know that I am among numerous visitors to Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge who are distressed to learn that the fragile integrity of that wildlife would be threatened by unanswered concerns regarding the Rio Grande Valley power transmission corridor. Daily flight plans will be compromised, the landscape will be scarred for miles and the tourist industry, therefore, at risk.</p> <p>Please work with the Friends of the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge to find solutions to these concerns that will benefit not only the wildlife but the quality of life for the local community and visitors.</p>	
1223	<p>Attached please find a Resolution of the Board of Directors for Friends of Saguaro National Park, expressing their opposition to any proposed SunZia power corridor route through the Avra Valley, near Tucson, AZ. While the Board certainly understands and appreciates the desirability of developing and transmitting renewable energy, they believe that any route through the Avra Valley would negatively impact the Tucson Mountain District of Saguaro National Park.</p> <p>EXCERPT FROM RESOLUTION:  WHEREAS, one of the routes proposed for environmental assessment would go through the Avra Valley, west of the Tucson Mountains, and near the west district of Saguaro National Park; and</p>	Friends of Saguaro National Park

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>WHEREAS, this route would degrade the visitor experience at Saguaro National Park by destroying the scenic viewsheds and negatively impacting the Park's wilderness character;</p> <p>...NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors for Friends of Saguaro National Park expresses its opposition to the proposed SunZia power corridor route through the Avra Valley ...</p>	
1227	<p>Besides all of that, we think those towers will take away from the beauty of our Natural Landscape. This property [in Mountainair, NM] has been in our family for three generations now (our children being the fourth generation), and we enjoy living out there just for the beauty of the land itself. Besides the dangerous and financial aspect, these towers would just be a permanent scar on our property and we don't want them.</p>	
1228	<p>The J-6 Mescal Community Development Organization appreciated the opportunity to review large wall maps which we shared with our neighborhoods located along the 1-10 corridor between and within the Buffalo Soldiers Electronic Testing Range and Pima County Conservation lands. Residents within our area mostly live in clustered population centers that cannot avoid impacts from the proposed powerline routes due to the narrow nature of the valley between the Whetstone Mountains and the Catalina Mountains. Rural qualities are highly valued in our tri-community area of J-6, Mescal, and Skyline as we serve as the western gateway to the San Pedro Valley and to Cochise County that markets its scenic vistas, remote recreational opportunities, western-movie production, and legendary history. Having parallel lines of 130' to 160' imposing towers is not conducive to the passive setting, experiences being marketed. Due to the topography of the valley, the powerline would be a visual scar that is seen and felt for miles.</p>	J-6 Mescal Community Development Organization
1255	<p>NPCA supports the development of renewable energy sources and understands the abundant wealth of solar and wind potential in the Southwest. However, when a project has potential impact on a national park unit, in this case White Sands National Monument, careful evaluation is warranted. We feel the following should be considered in this process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Before identifying the preferred alternative for the transmission corridor, a thorough analysis of the visual resource impacts to White Sands NM from the proposed eastern corridors should be conducted.</li> <li>-Line burial should be considered as mitigation to visual impacts or if this proves to be economically unviable, the transmission line and corridor should be removed from consideration.</li> </ul>	National Parks Conservation Association
1273	<p>I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed 500Kv power line. The E80-110-120 route will cross my property near Gran Quivira N.M. This property has been in my family for three generations. My Grandfather and Father have farmed and ranched on this land for almost one hundred years. They have nurtured and protected this land for me and future generations of my family. I want to also state that I am completely against all other routing proposals which will negatively impact agricultural lands. We take great pride in having some of the last remaining property in the western United States which has remained</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

<b>ID</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>AFFILIATION</b>
	<p>aesthetically pleasing. Implementation of such an unsightly non-essential transmission line will eternally impact the available uses of this property as well as disrupt the natural ecological environments of wildlife.</p> <p>SunZia wants to make the case that this line will serve the greater good of mankind because it will transport needed power to Arizona and California. So while Arizona and California reap the benefits of New Mexico's energy we will be left with the hideous invasive culmination of steel and concrete in our pristine landscape. At this same time neighboring states pawn off the burden and embodiment of urban growth and unrelenting energy needs in the form of power lines to New Mexico.</p>	
1274	<p>I would like to state my opposition to the proposed study area expansion. It does not provide any new routes that would relieve the serious concerns regarding the wildlife and the economy of the community. Routes with valley crossings between Socorro and Belen would still pose a hazard to the daily flight patterns of sandhill cranes and snow geese, as well as the migratory pathway for hundreds of thousands of other birds. The infrastructure for this transmission corridor will mar the landscape and be visible for many miles in the open vistas of the Middle Rio Grande Valley.</p>	
1293	<p>We are totally against the SunZia project though the Aravaipa Valley. This would be destroying the beautiful wilderness and views of our canyon. Please do not destroy this area.</p>	
1305	<p>We are residents of the Avra Valley and we do not want 500 kilovolt power lines near our homes, schools and community. We want the integrity of the Tucson Mitigation Corridor, set up to protect wildlife, to remain intact. We do not want our parks and communities at risk of noise and visual pollution. Use the existing I-10 corridor.</p>	
1306	<p>[P]hotography is important to the area. photographers from all over the country and the world bring their \$10,000 cameras to the Bosque every year. power lines would discourage the tourists. NM has the last unspoiled views in the U.S... help preserve the view at the Bosque Del Apache.</p>	
1308	<p>It is the very lack of development and landscape fragmentation which has created the political upheaval in the Upper SPRY that really distinguishes the MSPRV. It is what strikes the eye of any visitor and even the most casual observer. "Spanning this reach of river is a nearly unfragmented landscape linking the Galiuro and Winchester mountains with the Santa Catalina and Rincon mountains, which represents the narrowest intermountain distance between these ranges. Unfragmented landscapes are key indicators developed by biologists in assessing the conservation value of regions and sites and the imminence of the threat they face.</p>	Cascabel Working Group
1311	<p>When friends visit from out of state, we take them to the Bosque del Apache. It is at the Bosque del Apache that we often run across tourists who have come from Canada, Europe, and other countries for the world-</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>renowned migratory pathway.</p> <p>When we are there, along the river, in the fields, and along the trails we always note the beautiful ABSENCE of visible power lines, poles, signs, etc. I often think I have been allowed to travel back in time to New Mexico as it might have looked 150-200 years ago. If you were to install power lines anywhere near this area you would ruin pristine land and views that provide needed respite for animals and people.</p>	
1313	<p>It has come to my attention that a potential routing alignment for a SunZia transmission line is in consideration which would dissect our 4600 acre Master Planned Community Willow Springs. For obvious reasons we would be opposed to this location because we feel that the aesthetical impact would significantly diminish the future value of our project.</p>	Lennar Corporation
1345	<p><b>NPS Units Affected</b></p> <p>Eight NPS parks, consisting of eleven separate units are considered by NPS to have concerns of potential impacts ranging from major and significant to relatively insignificant in nature. NPS considers parks even as distant as twenty miles from the Study Area as those with possible concerns, and those impacts should be evaluated. Three NPS parks, consisting of five separate units lie within the SunZia Project Study Area: Saguaro National Park – East and West Units, White Sands National Monument, and Salinas Pueblo Missions National Monument – Gran Quivira and Abo Units. One National Historic Trail (NHT) managed by the NPS: the Camino Real de Tierro Adentro NHT.</p> <p>Six additional NPS parks lie outside, but within a twenty miles of the Study Area: Casa Grande Ruins National Monument – 2.5 miles outside, Tumacacori National Historic Park – 18.5 miles outside, Fort Bowie National Historic Site – 7 miles outside, Chiricahua National Monument – 12.6 miles outside, Chamizal National Memorial – 14.1 miles outside, and Salinas Pueblo Missions National Monument – Quarai Unit – 3.5 miles outside. Two National Natural Landmarks (NNL) lie in close proximity to the Study Area. Nine additional NNLs are outside of the Study Area in Arizona and New Mexico, but all of them should be considered as indicated in specific comments below. One National Historic Trail, the El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro National Historic Trail would be crossed by any alternative proposed for the SunZia Transmission Line. This trail, managed by the BLM and NPS in partnership with the Camino Real Trail Association, should be considered in the EIS for impact evaluation and mitigation.</p> <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>NPS believes that the visual impacts to visitors would be greatest when the proposed transmission lines are in closest proximity to the park unit and where the current and historic viewsheds from the park unit are integrally tied to each other. Closely associated to the proximity concerns of the proposed transmission lines would then be both the: 1) Scale (linearly and in height) of the transmission lines and support towers, and the 2) Extensive viewsheds found in much of Arizona and New Mexico.</p> <p>We request that BLM consider all NPS units within and in proximity to</p>	National Park Service

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	the Study Area for new visual resource inventories and evaluated in their updated classes of visual resource management. We believe that a number of the NPS units would be appropriately placed in the highest level of viewshed protection: Class 1.	
1383	First, THANK YOU for eliminating the route through the Windmill Ranches sub-division in Ancho, NM. We know nothing is finalized yet, but this gives us hope, and takes unwanted stress off our daily lives!! Second, these are our thoughts on the other proposed routes in our area: Please DO NOT SELECT D10, as that goes along our front mountain views.	
	There are several Pima County Code issues to consider. Sandario, Mile Wide, Kinney, and Gates Pass Roads are designated Major Scenic Routes by the Pima County Zoning Code and have views of the proposed SunZia project. The intent of this designation is to preserve and enhance the visual resources of the natural and built environment. SunZia routes within one mile of TMP are also in the Pima County Buffer Overlay Zone. One purpose of the Buffer Overlay Zone is to foster wildlife habitat in the vicinity of Pima County's public preserves. Finally, much of the private land adjacent to TMP and the TMC is included in the Resource Transition land use category of the Pima County Comprehensive Plan, and development of such lands are to blend with the natural landscape and support environmentally sensitive linkages.	
1396	In 2008, Pima County completed a Management Plan for TMP that addresses the Tucson Mitigation Corridor; lease properties such as the Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum (ASDM); and visual, biological, and cultural resource management. Management of the Tucson Mitigation Corridor is governed by a cooperative agreement between Pima County, Arizona Game and Fish Department and the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bureau acquired the TMC as partial mitigation for the Central Arizona Project, and in the Bureau's April 26, 2010 correspondence to BLM, they clearly oppose use of the TMC for the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project. According to the TMP Management Plan, 1.4 million people visit the park on an annual basis not including drive through commuters. 870,000, or 62 percent, visit the world renowned ASDM, Gates Pass Overlook and the other park pull outs. ASDM, Gates Pass Overlook and many of the park roads and trails incorporate a view to the west of the same iconic Sonoran Desert landscape proposed for the construction of potentially two 190-foot high, 500kv transmission lines by SunZia. Negative visual impacts associated with this project may result in negative impacts to the multimillion dollar tourist industry of southern Arizona.	Pima County (AZ)
<b>CODE 060.00 Recreation</b>		
1030	My husband and I live less than a mile from where Sunzia wants to put a transmission line. We live on the North end of Bosquecito Road near Quebradas Road. We have experienced how very dangerous these lines are; we have a 100 million dollar lawsuit with 14 other plaintiffs (Gunn Hill vs Los Angeles Dept. of Water and Power) Attorneys Howarth &	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	Smith. Though the case has yet to be settled, the lawsuit has stopped the building of the 3rd power plant in Delta UT. The Rio Grande River from Cochiti Lake to Elephant Butte is critical habitat for the Silver Minnow and the Southwest Willow Flycatcher as well as the Bald Eagle that winters in the Rio Grande area. The area is heavy use by horseback riders, hikers, bicyclists, motorcyclists, and campers who would be adversely affected by these proposed lines.	
1038	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the proposed project is authorized and some new service roads created, we may advocate for leaving specific roads accessible to sportsmen and outdoor recreationists. Identification of these service roads would require close coordination with the Department.</li> </ul>	Arizona Game and Fish Department
1123	<p>As residents and land owners in Lincoln County, New Mexico, we are writing in support of the proposed substation in our County and for the development of alternative transmission routes that connect to this substation. New Mexico has an abundance of renewable energy sources and has already taken steps toward increasing the use of converted wind, solar, and geothermal resources into electricity. Still needed are steps to construct the transmission infrastructure that will deliver the electricity to market. The SunZia Southwest Transmission Project will further this process as well as stimulate the local economy by needed jobs and tax revenue.</p> <p>The Bureau of Land Management has done an excellent job in soliciting public opinions and identifying the potential environmental impacts for the SunZia project. The proposed alternatives that have been identified will have minimal impact on visual space, recreational activities, biological and cultural resources, land use, and water/air/noise quality. Please grant the SunZia project all necessary permits to help New Mexico remain a leader in clean energy.</p>	
1228	The J-6 Mescal Community Development Organization appreciated the opportunity to review large wall maps which we shared with our neighborhoods located along the 1-10 corridor between and within the Buffalo Soldiers Electronic Testing Range and Pima County Conservation lands. Residents within our area mostly live in clustered population centers that cannot avoid impacts from the proposed powerline routes due to the narrow nature of the valley between the Whetstone Mountains and the Catalina Mountains. Rural qualities are highly valued in our tri-community area of J-6, Mescal, and Skyline as we serve as the western gateway to the San Pedro Valley and to Cochise County that markets its scenic vistas, remote recreational opportunities, western-movie production, and legendary history. Having parallel lines of 130' to 160' imposing towers is not conducive to the passive setting, experiences being marketed.	J-6 Mescal Community Development Organization
1255	Founded in 1919, the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) is America's leading advocate for the national parks. Our mission is to protect and enhance America's national park system for present and future generations. NPCA believes that our parks should be well funded, broadly and enthusiastically visited, respectfully experienced, and cherished for the national treasures that they are to all of us. To achieve our mission, NPCA conducts research, designs solutions, mobilizes	National Parks Conservation Association

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

<b>ID</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>AFFILIATION</b>
	<p>diverse constituencies, and advocates for the parks before policy makers and the courts.</p> <p>NPCA has more than 315,000 members, 164 staff members, and 24 regional and field offices throughout the country. NPCA supports the development of renewable energy sources and understands the abundant wealth of solar and wind potential in the Southwest. However, when a project has potential impact on a national park unit, in this case White Sands National Monument, careful evaluation is warranted.</p>	
1338	<p>Routes north of the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge will compromise the establishment purpose of the Bosque del Apache NWR and even the Ladd S. Gordon Waterfowl Complex managed by the New Mexico Department of Game &amp; Fish and could significantly harm the financial investments in habitat restoration and forage for birds made by the federal and state governments. Bosque del Apache NWR was established using the authority of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 712d) of 1936, to provide refuge and breeding grounds for migratory birds and other wildlife as well as incidental fish and wildlife-oriented recreational development, the protection of natural resources, and the conservation of endangered species or threatened species.</p> <p>Because of the The Belen Waterfowl Area is four miles south of Belen on New Mexico 109. This 230-acre farm grows corn and alfalfa for migrating waterfowl. The Casa Colorado Waterfowl Area comprised of 420 acres of cultivated crops is six miles south of Belen on New Mexico 304. The Bernardo Waterfowl Area is 17 miles south of Belen near Bernardo and straddles U.S. Highway 60. This property consists of more than 1,700 acres with 450 acres in cultivation and is open to the public on most days, with recent improvements for bird viewing and photography platforms. An auto tour loop and two short hiking trails also give visitors views of birds in fields and ponds.</p>	Audubon New Mexico
1365	<p>Of concern is the integrity and maintenance of the Bosque del Apache Wildlife Refuge and its environs for its flora, fauna, and aesthetic values. The refuge and scenic values now provide economic values for tourism, recreation, and education for the rural communities in the area through the planned management of the wildlife refuge. Birdwatchers come from around the country and the world for bird watching during the periods of bird migrations and winter nesting season. These uses and its values must be maintained.</p>	
	<p>Sandario, Mile Wide, Kinney, and Gates Pass Roads are designated Major Scenic Routes by the Pima County Zoning Code and have views of the proposed SunZia project. The intent of this designation is to preserve and enhance the visual resources of the natural and built environment. SunZia routes within one mile of TMP are also in the Pima County Buffer Overlay Zone. One purpose of the Buffer Overlay Zone is to foster wildlife habitat in the vicinity of Pima County's public preserves. Finally, much of the private land adjacent to TMP and the TMC is included in the Resource Transition land use category of the Pima County Comprehensive Plan, and development of such lands are to blend with the natural landscape and support environmentally sensitive linkages.</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>In 2008, Pima County completed a Management Plan for TMP that addresses the Tucson Mitigation Corridor; lease properties such as the Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum (ASDM); and visual, biological, and cultural resource management. Management of the Tucson Mitigation Corridor is governed by a cooperative agreement between Pima County, Arizona Game and Fish Department and the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bureau acquired the TMC as partial mitigation for the Central Arizona Project, and in the Bureau's April 26, 2010 correspondence to BLM, they clearly oppose use of the TMC for the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project.</p>	
1396	<p>According to the TMP Management Plan, 1.4 million people visit the park on an annual basis not including drive through commuters. 870,000, or 62 percent, visit the world renowned ASDM, Gates Pass Overlook and the other park pull outs. ASDM, Gates Pass Overlook and many of the park roads and trails incorporate a view to the west of the same iconic Sonoran Desert landscape proposed for the construction of potentially two 190-foot high, 500kv transmission lines by SunZia. Negative visual impacts associated with this project may result in negative impacts to the multimillion dollar tourist industry of southern Arizona.</p>	Pima County (AZ)
1431	<p>I am most concerned about the proposed routes through the Aravaipa Canyon watershed and the San Pedro Valley. Recreation opportunities are abundant and include hiking, birding and wildlife watching, fishing, and more.</p>	
<b>CODE 070.00 Biological Resources</b>		
908	<p>Proposed segment C276 would deface the central scenic focus of the Cascabel community – the set of cliffs along the west side of the San Pedro River. The cliffs have the following significance: 3. Biology – the micro environments at the foot of the cliffs host a set of species not seen elsewhere at similar altitude.</p>	
922	<p>The northern route through the Aravaipa would be a huge mistake. The area is pristine supporting natural plant and wildlife. 500kV high voltage lines through this area would open roads in areas that when it rains would destroy with erosion all the area around the disturbed ground. There are ranches in that area that have kept the area intact, and all the wildlife and plant life undisturbed.</p>	Eureka Springs Property Owners Association
942	<p>Honestly, I would prefer an energy shortage in my home to the damage that could be done to the San Pedro River Valley. I realize the possible benefits that could come from connections to renewable energy sources yet I cannot comprehend how those benefits could outweigh the costs from the devastation of a fragile ecosystem. Once the pylons would be put in place there would be no restoration. Our desert has already been damaged enough. I would prefer to preserve the little pieces we have left. In todays world there is very little left to nature. The San Pedro is a key habitat for many species that now have now where else to go. With such a fragile ecosystem, even if no one were to use the access road and</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	maintain the pylons the desert would not recover within my life time. Please find another route that would have less devastating consequences.	
943	After having reviewed the information about the project presented here today, I believe it makes the most sense to choose one of the alternatives that closely follows the existing I-10 corridor and skirts Tucson to the south. This would minimize the impact on important natural resources in southern Arizona, including the San Pedro Valley and Aravaipa Valley and canyon. Constructing the transmission line through these sensitive natural areas would unnecessarily expose them to habitat degradation and future development, forever damaging them and diminishing their value as pristine refuges from the city.	
1002	<p>The E-80 route on the proposed SunZia Transmission Project crosses our New Mexico Grazing Leases GM 3065, GO 1550, and GO 1191 and comes very close to our house and the ranch headquarters on fee simple land. That route will significantly affect our ranch and our way of life ...</p> <p>The Boyd Ranch and others nearby in this large undeveloped area are rich with wildlife because of the absence of roads, highways, housing developments, transmission lines and people. On our ranch we have deer, antelope, elk, coyotes, mountain lions, bear, Oryx, bobcats, rabbits of course, fox, and various other small animals and a rich population of birds including great blue heron, various ducks, Scott's oriole, owls, golden eagles, wild turkeys, quail, doves, swallows and many more common birds. Without being declared, it is a wildlife refuge which can not be replaced once it is sullied.</p>	
1047	<p>In addition to these potential visitor experience and wilderness impacts, we are concerned about the impacts to local natural resources, particularly the wildlife habitat loss and fragmentation that occurs from such a large linear development. Insularization of the park from other protected natural areas is a crucial management issue for wildlife. Both districts of the park are increasingly surrounded by urbanization and development. The San Pedro River Valley, on the east side of the Rincon Mountain District of the Park, is an important wildlife corridor and link to other protected natural areas such as the Galiuro and Redfield Canyon Wilderness Areas.</p> <p>Saguaro National Park receives over 700,000 visitors to the park each year from all over the world, generating over \$23 million in visitor spending. In combination with the Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum and Pima County's Tucson Mountain Park west of Interstate 10, millions of visitors and citizens rely on these areas for rest, recreation, solace, and education about our unique Sonoran Desert resources. We cannot afford to alter this landscape.</p>	National Park Service – Saguaro
1052	I appreciated the opportunity for Mr. Bruce Ellis of my staff to meet with you and the project proponent and consultants on April 2 in Tucson. However, the Avra Valley route that was discussed in that meeting would bisect Central Arizona Project's (CAP) Tucson Mitigation Corridor, which serves as a preserve for wildlife and plants and provides an undeveloped corridor for large mammals to move between the Tucson Mountains to the east and the Roskrige Mountains	Bureau of Reclamation

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	to the west. Reclamation acquired the 4.25-square-mile corridor as partial mitigation for biological impacts resulting from construction and operation of the CAP Tucson Aqueduct. Reclamation signed a cooperative agreement with the Arizona Game and Fish Department and the Pima County Parks and Recreation Department for the management of these lands, including agreement to oppose any further development within the corridor. Reclamation has consistently opposed, and continues to oppose, use of the corridor for any use that could adversely affect plants, wildlife, and wildlife movement for which the corridor was established.	
1080	Environmental degradation comes from noise, electromagnetic radiation, erosion, wild fires, increased traffic (air and surface), collisions by migratory birds and fragmentation of habitat, All these threaten the multiple raptor species, doves, quail, cactus wren, pronghorn antelope, oryx, mule deer, coyote, gray fox, cottontail and jack rabbits, owls, ravens, bats, and many other kinds of wildlife that live in this pristine valley. In addition, our ranch's western, leased BLM land is part of the Stallion WSA, a preserve in the Sierra Larga Hills. Placing power lines just a short walk from this WSA, with all their hazards, is unacceptable because it would destroy those attributes that are the reasons the land was preserved in the first place.	
1169	The City has a long-standing commitment to the preservation of sensitive environmental resources including watercourses and associated riparian habitat, and habitat for vulnerable wildlife and plant species. Lands within the City, particularly those south of Interstate 10, and lands owned by the City of Tucson in Avra Valley, west of the Tucson Mountains, provide habitat for several endangered, threatened, and candidate species. Both areas are shown as potential locations for transmission lines. The City has been involved in the development of Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs) under Section 10 of the Endangered Species Act for these two areas. Those plans are available for your review and we request that they be considered in the development of the SunZia Project EIS. The City also recognizes the significant value provided by riparian habitat and has regulated impacts to watercourses for more than 20 years. Major watercourses such as the Santa Cruz, Rillito, and Pantano are especially important and the City, Pima County, the Town of Marana, and Army Corps of Engineers have invested millions of dollars in developing restoration plans for portions of these watercourses. These restoration plans, and the City's overall goal of minimizing impacts to riparian habitat, should also be taken into consideration.	City of Tucson
1207	Many from the Cascabel area have expressed their disbelief and outrage at the concept of the proposed SunZia transmission line through the San Pedro Valley. I understand that a route through Aravaipa is now even being considered. I want to again add my name to the list of people who strenuously object to both those routes. Both would be environmental disasters. There are alternative routes that are already environmentally compromised. Why mess up someplace else on this earth?  A mile wide corridor through an area you have cared for like your	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

<b>ID</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>AFFILIATION</b>
	backyard would be a threat to animals, birds, people, and some endangered fish. A swath through the valley would also disrupt plant continuity and viability.	
1259	The real cost of the project [through the San Pedro River Valley] will be felt in interrupted wildlife corridors, disturbed habitat, and in the opening up of wild lands to unmonitored use by all-terrain and off-road vehicles. This will inevitably lead to erosion, loss of vegetation, and siltation in the aquatic habitats.	
1305	We are residents of the Avra Valley and we do not want 500 kilovolt power lines near our homes, schools and community. We want the integrity of the Tucson Mitigation Corridor, set up to protect wildlife, to remain intact.	
1336	<p>I am writing to comment about the proposed construction of two 500-kilovolt power lines along the San Pedro River Valley. The San Pedro River corridor is internationally recognized as an Important Bird Area. As an active birder who has been birding along the San Pedro River for over 30 years, I am strongly opposed to the construction of a power line in the lower San Pedro watershed. Construction of power lines should be restricted to already developed corridors such as I-10 and other existing utility transmission sites.</p> <p>Preservation of undisturbed habitat along the San Pedro is crucial for the 350 species of birds and 87 species of mammals who use this area for migration and breeding. In addition to providing habitat for birds and animals, the thousands of birders who visit the San Pedro annually helps the economy of Southern Arizona. Riparian corridors are fast disappearing throughout Arizona and the rest of the United States. The San Pedro Watershed is such a treasure that its protection should be the highest priority for the BLM.</p>	
1355	I am opposed to SunZia's proposed transmission routes through Arizona's wilderness areas that include Aravaipa and the San Pedro. Aravaipa is the home of my ancestors. I am a Great Grand Daughter of Captain Chiquito a Pinal/San Carlos Apache whose land there has come to me and other descendants. We have recently come together to protect the already very fragile ecosystem on our land and the Canyon health as a whole. I appreciate the conservation value of renewable energy, but delivering it at the expense of a fragile environment is irresponsible. I am told there are routes through Tucson using existing infrastructure corridors which would have far less impact on the environment. If this project is to go forward, the obvious solution is for SunZia to work with local Arizona power companies and route the transmission lines accordingly, with as little disruption to the environment as possible.	
1396	Avra Valley Routes Both Tucson Mountain Park (TMPJ) and the Tucson Mitigation Corridor (TMC) are part of the Pima County Conservation Lands System. The SDCP [Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan] identified priority vulnerable species, cultural resources, special management areas and critical linkages that may be impacted by the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project. The project proponents are advised to consider the wealth of information available from the SDCP.	Pima County (AZ)

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>In 2008, Pima County completed a Management Plan for TMP that addresses the Tucson Mitigation Corridor; lease properties such as the Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum (ASDM); and visual, biological, and cultural resource management. Management of the Tucson Mitigation Corridor is governed by a cooperative agreement between Pima County, Arizona Game and Fish Department and the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bureau acquired the TMC as partial mitigation for the Central Arizona Project, and in the Bureau's April 26, 2010 correspondence to BLM, they clearly oppose use of the TMC for the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project.</p> <p>In their April 16, 2010 letter to BLM, Saguaro National Park refers to wildlife habitat loss and fragmentation as one of the reasons they oppose SunZia routes adjacent to Saguaro National Park. Pima County is committed to the expansion of biological connections between TMP and other natural resource areas. A proposed 1,000-foot wide right of way for the SunZia Southwest Transmission project will compromise the intent of the existing TMC biological connection to Saguaro National Park, the Brawley/Black Wash Complex and the mountain ranges of the Ironwood Forest National Monument to the west.</p> <p><b>Cienega Valley Transmission Line Corridor</b></p> <p>The Cienega Creek Natural Preserve along with National Park and Forest fall within the Pima County Conservation Lands System. The SDCP identified priority vulnerable species, cultural resources, special management areas and critical linkages in this area that may be impacted by the SunZia Southwest Transmission project. In addition, Highway 83, a major tourist transportation area, would be impacted by these corridors. In addition, Saguaro National Park refers to wildlife habitat loss and fragmentation as one of the reasons they oppose SunZia routes adjacent to Saguaro National Park. Pima County is committed to the expansion of biological connections between Saguaro National Park East, the County's Cienega Creek Natural Preserve, the Coronado National Forest and other natural resource areas. A proposed 1,000-foot wide right of way for the SunZia Southwest Transmission project will compromise the intent of creating these natural wildlife linkages.</p> <p>The Pima County Board of Supervisors established Conditions, Covenants and Restrictions (CC&amp;Rs) that pertain to nearly all of the land located within the Cienega Creek Natural Preserve (floodplain, floodway and flood erosion zone). Under these CC&amp;Rs, 'all parallel installations, including without limitation sewers, are prohibited'. Along with the Priority Vulnerable Species listed under the SDCP, the Preserve also has known populations of federally listed threatened and endangered species that could be impacted by the project. These species include Gila topminnow, Gila chub and the Huachuca water umbel. In addition, the majority of the lands in the Preserve are set aside as mitigation for the County's Multi-species Conservation Plan, which requires the properties be maintained with no degradation to the natural ecosystems. It appears the majority of the alternative routes through Cienega Creek run parallel with the Preserve and would not be permitted. Any routes that run perpendicular to the Preserve would be permitted on a case-by-case basis, and require written approval by the</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	Pima County Regional Flood Control District. Any impacts within the Preserve will require mitigation in accordance with the specific mitigation requirements dictated by the CC&Rs. Under the leadership of the Arizona Game and Fish Department, an interdisciplinary and key stakeholder group has begun the process of identifying critical wildlife movement corridors in Pinal County. Similar projects are in various stages of development in other counties, including Pima County. The proposed SunZia routes would impact a number of these.	
<b>CODE 071.00 Waterfowl/Migratory Birds</b>		
884	I do not believe the new proposals address the issues of a river crossing between Bosque del Apache and Belen. Any crossing must be underground to preserve the integrity of the daily flight paths of sandhill cranes and migratory routes for other birds. Routes adjacent to Belen still mar the landscape/viewscape as they come past Socorro and San Antonio. Any new lines between San Antonio and Belen will damage our already struggling farmers and our ecotourisms bas that is inherently tied to our open spaces and beautiful scenery.	
899	Socorro County is the second poorest county in NM. It's primary source of income (besides employees at Stallion) is generated by ecotourism. People come here to enjoy the vast scenic vistas. This project has the potential to destroy a major source of income as well as impact a major migratory flyway. I am opposed to the concept of destroying our vistas, impacting our wildlife to benefit AZ and CA.	
909	The San Pedro is a critical flyway for migratory birds, over half of bird species are in sharp decline due in part to increased collisions with power lines and towers. The middle San Pedro River Valley must be considered as a whole, intact ecologically integral system. Dividing it into its constituent parts to study the impact of the lines denies its true value as an irreplaceable ecosystem – one of the few remaining sensitive desert areas of the Southwest.	
938	Under no circumstances should any SunZia lines pass through the San Pedro Watershed! The San Pedro Watershed shelters numbers of birds, fish, mammals, and other species virtually unparalleled in the United States. The San Pedro is one of the most important migratory bird corridors in North America while collision or electrocution by powerlines is the single greatest human-related killer of birds each year in the U.S.. The list of threatened, endangered, and candidate species in the San Pedro Valley's [illegible] and many of them would be adversely impacted by habitat fragmentation, erosion, stream sedimentation, spread of invasive species along access roads, etc.	
978	The wind blows in Arizona, and the sun shines there. If they want to have a power plant, they can have one, but not over here where it is going to cross Bosque Del Apache, the flyway which is used by tens of thousands of migratory birds every year for about the last 60,000 years. The government spent a lot of money, and the rest of us spent a lot of volunteer time making sure that that's a good place for them. Obviously, we can't do without energy, but we can do without energy traveling 600 miles for no good reason.	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
982	[The proposed transmission lines'] right in the fly path, right in the fly path of migrating birds to the Bosque Del Apache. Those birds have been doing this for thousands and thousands of years. They aren't going to know to take another route, and we've spent millions trying to protect them and build this environment for them to enhance their environment.	
984	I don't think we're going to have too much control over where the line crosses, but I am very concerned about destroying wildlife habitat. And I understand there is the option to bury the lines whenever it encroaches the flyway of the migratory birds up and down the river.	
990	<p>I am an officer of the Friends of Bosque Del Apache, the wildlife refuge that's at issue. And I think I'm already on the mailing list. Anyway, I have two comments. One of them is that if the line eventually crosses the Rio Grande where birds are using it up and down the river all winter, I feel it should go underground.</p> <p>The other comment is that there is an area of the Rio Grande south of Hatch where there's a narrow canyon, agricultural fields on either side the river and mesas on both east and west of the river where there could be an overhead crossing. And I don't know whether anybody has considered that possibility, but it's about 14 to 15 miles southeast of Hatch, right along the river.</p> <p>And there's a stretch – I don't know – two or three miles where there's no agriculture because it's a narrow canyon, and that is a possible place where the crossing could be done overhead without risking a lot for the birds that might use the river, because there should be minimal use of the river by the birds since there's no fields there.</p>	
1030	The Rio Grande River from Cochiti Lake to Elephant Butte is critical habitat for the Silver Minnow and the Southwest Willow Flycatcher as well as the Bald Eagle that winters in the Rio Grande area.	
1036	<p>I specifically recommend Route numbers A 181 and A300 (or alternately, A250) as the Proposed Route for the SunZia DEIS. It is wisest to follow a path cutting diagonally west-southwest from the new sub-station. then skirting past the northwest corner of White Sands Missile Range property just south of Highway 380, and turning immediately south, following the WSMR boundary to the point where the line must head west in order to cross the Rio Grande just south of Arrey, NM. Here are the reasons I request this route:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It avoids all NWRs, WSAs, WAs, ACECs, and conservation easements.</li> <li>• It avoids relatively populated agricultural and scenic areas.</li> <li>• It avoids the low-altitude migratory avian flyway through Rio bosques.</li> </ul>	Rio Grande Agricultural Land Trust Board Member
1038	<p>Southern Routes in the Vicinity of Interstate 10</p> <p>1) Beginning from the Arizona-New Mexico Border, we believe the proposed routes should parallel 1-10 (B 150 and Alternate 22) as much as possible before diverting north along highway 191 or further west. We are unclear of the rationalization of the three northern routes (B 160, B 170, Alternate 12 and Proposed 35) that go through the Peloncillo Mountains connecting with highway 191.</p>	Arizona Game and Fish Department

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	2) The proposed route (F10) beginning near Willcox, then heading south around the playa to Benson, could be detrimental to migratory sandhill cranes and waterfowl.	
1040	<p>The expanded study area encompasses the Ladd S. Gordon properties, belonging to the NM State Game Commission and managed by NMDGF to provide food and habitat for wintering waterfowl and other migratory birds. A map is enclosed showing the Game Commission properties within the expanded SunZia study area.</p> <p>Listed species known to occur on one or more of these properties include Rio Grande Silvery Minnow (state and federal Endangered), Neotropical Cormorant (state Threatened), Bald Eagle (state Threatened), and Southwestern Willow Flycatcher (state and federal Endangered). Our concerns about potential bird strike impacts related to the Rio Grande crossing, expressed in our initial response to scoping for this project (NMDGF Project No. 12739, dated July 13, 2009), continue to apply to the latest expanded study area.</p>	New Mexico Department of Game and Fish
1042	<p>Although I support the construction of a new power line to support "green power" I believe this line should run along routes to the east and south and NOT along the Rio Grande Corridor flyway. Routes with valley crossings between Socorro and Belen would pose a great hazard to the seasonal and daily flight patterns of the Sandhill Cranes and Snow Geese as well as the hundreds of thousands of birds that migrate along this route.</p> <p>River crossings and valley transmission lines will kill many avifauna that already suffer from reduced and threatened populations due to habitat loss and climate change relative to global warming.</p> <p>The route along the eastern boundary of White Sands is the most feasible, I believe.</p> <p>Any route through the Sevilleta National Wildlife Refuge, the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge and the Rio Grande Corridor is absurd and completely abusive.</p> <p>Furthermore, it would be eco-smart to color the lines in some fashion that birds may see, even at night . As for the disruption to the ground regarding pole installation, non-contaminating products and minimal soil disruption should be observed.</p>	
1058	<p>The March 31, 2010, notice of expanded study area in New Mexico includes three additional alternative routes that are further north of the WSMR and crossing the Rio Grande in the vicinity of the Sevilleta NWR. Due to potential conflicts with migratory bird movement along the Rio Grande and Los Pinos Mountains corridors, as well as Service goals to conserve and enhance private and public lands along the Rio Grande, we remain concerned about any route that passes through Sevilleta NWR or immediately adjacent to its boundary. Furthermore, we are concerned that migratory, wintering, and nesting birds and the riparian habitat on which they rely may be affected by any crossing of the Rio Grande in Socorro or Valencia County. For example, this corridor may support nesting southwestern willow flycatchers (<i>Empidonax traillii extimus</i>), a federally listed endangered species. We</p>	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>believe any crossing of the historic flood plain of the Rio Grande in the vicinity of Bosque del Apache NWR and northward should be subterranean to minimize impacts to migratory birds.</p> <p>Arizona Expanded Study Area</p> <p>The Service's concern with impacts to bats and migratory birds (e.g., raptors, waterfowl, and other large birds) is common to all potential routes listed above. Similarly, our concern with direct impacts to aquatic resources (via placement of structures and clearing of wetland and riparian-obligate vegetation and indirect impacts via sedimentation, elevated peak flows, and increased traffic) are common to all routes. The applicable narratives from our September 14, 2009 and March 11, 2010, memoranda are also incorporated herein via reference.</p>	
1070	<p>On behalf of the Friends of the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge, and as a citizen who lives in the flyway, I would like to convey our opposition to the proposed study area expansion, as it does not provide any new routes that would relieve our concerns regarding the wildlife and economy of our community. Routes with valley crossings between Socorro and Belen would still pose a hazard to the daily flight patterns of sandhill cranes and snow geese, as well as the migratory pathway for hundreds of thousands of other birds.</p>	
1146	<p>One of the possible routes you have proposed for the SunZia 500 KV power lines passes through San Acacia, Polvadera, and/or Lemitar in Socorro County. I strongly object to your using this corridor and ask that you use one of your alternate corridors instead. All things considered, the corridor(s) along White Sands would seem to be far better alternatives.</p> <p>My objection is based on...(3) possible negative effects on the migratory, reproductive and nesting behavior of the tens (hundreds?) of thousands of birds which migrate here annually; and (4) associated negative effects on the birdcentered tourist industry in the City of Socorro, the Bosque del Apache and surrounding communities.</p>	
1148	<p>I am writing to voice my objection to one of the possible power line routes for the SunZia Transmission Project, specifically, the one within the corridor that passes through San Acacia, Polvadera and or Lemitar in Socorro County. As a resident of Polvadera, I am concerned about various negative effects of these power lines and associated towers. Another concern regards possible effects on birds' migratory behavior. This proposed route lies directly in the flight path of thousands of birds migrating to the Bosque del Apache and points further south.</p> <p>Disruption would affect not only the birds but also the tourist industry in this area (particularly in the City of Socorro and at the Bosque), due to the large number of "birders" who come here in the fall to observe the many species who winter here.</p>	
1151	<p>I respectfully request that the BLM only approve a plan that does NOT cross the Bosque del Apache NWR in anyway, compromise the agricultural fields that provide necessary feed for migratory birds, or cross the Rio Grande River in the migratory flight path of birds such as the Sandhill Crane. There are alternative choices such as on the east side</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>of White Sands Missile Range that would result in substantially less impact on wildlife and the environment.</p> <p>The whole idea of a wildlife refuge is just that – it's a refuge from humans and human activity, including powerlines. The focus of our decisions needs to renewable energy with minimal impact on wildlife and their habitat.</p>	
1160	<p>Please consider the proposed power line corridor that was proposed in SunZia's original 2008 filing – the route that follows White Sands Missile Range western fence line and crosses the Rio Grande south of the Caballo reservoir. This route will have the least impact on both bird migration paths and property values than the other proposed routes.</p>	
1179	<p>I am in opposition of any route configurations that ignore flyway and view scape issues. SunZia must acknowledge the more suitable routes to the east and south and obtain the appropriate scientific support and data to demonstrate minimal environmental impact. It has been demonstrated that better route and underground placement are feasible and not cost-prohibitive; now SunZia must make the responsible decision not to bulldoze through the small community and wildlife that cannot handle and do not want this project. Routes with valley crossings between Socorro and Belen would still pose a hazard to the daily flight patterns of sandhill cranes and snow geese, as well as the migratory pathway for hundreds of thousands of other birds.</p>	
1256	<p>I'm a strong supporter of green energy, and just as strong on protecting migratory birds. The Sun Zia line running by the Bosque del Apache would create a major hazard for the migratory birds in one of their prime habitats. I would like to know the projected electrocution kill of raptors, which are the birds most likely to perch on lines, and likely impact kills on non-raptors.</p>	
1263	<p>I am writing because I want the Bosque del Apache protected from any impact from the SunZia transmission project. The Bosque is on the flyway used by 60,000 ducks, 20,000 cranes, and 40,000 geese. The Bosque is a precious treasure to save for us and future generations. The Bosque del Apache also contributes to the economic vitality of Socorro and the surrounding communities. I prefer that the transmission line route be located on the east side of White Sands Missile Range and continue south to Fort Bliss. My second preference is for the power line to cross at Derry-Arrey and follow the northwest boundary of the White Sands Missile Range and head east at Highway 380. Please protect our wildlife!</p>	
1308	<p>But its [Commission for Environmental Cooperation] focus was the fact that "The San Pedro River supports one of the most important migratory bird habitats in North America; indeed, roughly half of the birds that breed in this arid region are dependent upon it. Along with possessing "one of the highest bird diversities of areas its size in the United States they called the supporting habitats "of special continental importance..." For these reasons, in 1995 the American Bird Conservancy, in partnership with Partners in Flight and the National Audubon Society, named the SPRNCA a Globally Important Bird Area. This was the first</p>	<p>Cascabel Working Group</p>

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>designation of this kind in the Western Hemisphere. What is relevant here is that the prominence generically ascribed to the San Pedro River (SPR) is equally applicable in its lower reaches. Virtually all of the significant biological features of the Upper SPR apply to its middle and lower reaches, as should the managerial prescriptions, as it wends its way north to the Gila River. After all, " ... ecosystem management efforts that end abruptly at administrative or international boundaries are, in the long-term, unlikely to accomplish the overall goal of biodiversity conservation. The CEC itself concurred, noting that:</p> <p>The expert team has adopted a bird's-eye-view of habitat availability, which transcends political boundaries. We consider the United States and Mexican reaches of the basin a single hydrologic entity. ... The objective of this investigation is to provide information that will help maintain a high quality, self sustaining riparian ecosystem within and beyond the San Pedro Riparian National Conservation Area....all North Americans benefit from, and have a stake in preserving this riparian habitat and the migratory birdlife that it supports...</p> <p>It is abundantly clear that the attributes cited by the CEC and for SPRNCA apply to the Middle SPRV (MSPRV). This reach of the SPR also partakes of the same internationally renowned biodiversity, and evidently more so than the Upper SPRV. While also partaking of the Madrean and Petran Woodlands that make up the Sky Islands ranges, here the Sonoran Desertscrub (154.12) comes from the north and west to meet the Chihuahuan Desertscrub ( ) of the valley half way. There is also only north of Interstate-10 the Interior Chaparral (133.3) rimming the ranges of the MSPRV, as well as immediately proximate biotic communities to the valley that are not present further south – the Plains and Great Basin Grasslands (142.3) of Allen Flat through which the SunZia route would pass on its way to the Winchester substation, and the Great Basin Conifer Woodland (122.4) in the Aravaipa Valley just east of Kielberg Canyon. Within a 25 mile radius of the central MSPRV exists eight biotic communities, as great as any area in the American Southwest, twice as many as in the Upper SPRV.</p> <p>This extraordinary biodiversity will be returned to when looking more pointedly at the ecoregional influences in the MSPRV, and especially when reviewing in depth the vertebrate populations in the area. But when addressing the San Pedro River per se, it is its preeminence as the main flight corridor for neotropical migrant birds in the West that elicits the greatest attention. The studies that substantiate the SPRY's "continental importance" bear out that those migrating birds do not suddenly change watersheds when reaching the Lower SPRV. A third of the monitoring stations for the principal study in that regard were in the MSPRV, two in the canyons of upper Hot Springs Canyon tributaries, and two on the SPR not far north of its confluence with Hot Springs and Paige Canyons. Some of the most significant data comes from those sites. Indeed, one of the principal biologists in the study indicated that the highest densities of neotropical migrants were found in Cascabel where birds showed inter-species aggression indicating limitations of habitat.</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1327	<p>A very direct route through BLM and maybe some state land could go from there past the Ruins of Ft. Mason (see p. 46 of the deLorme New Mexico Atlas &amp; Gazetteer) to the Rio Grande 3-5 miles north of Radium Springs. There is a river reach of about 4 miles there (14-15 miles SE of Hatch) with high mesas on both sides and NO agriculture because there is virtually no floodplain. A high power line crossing of the river there would be a minimum risk to birds such as the cranes and snow geese. It would also be considerably cheaper than the underground river crossing that may well be demanded anywhere near San Antonio, Socorro, Lemitar, or up toward Belen.</p>	
1328	<p>If the powerline must be built then the best route would be as far away from sensitive wildlife habitat and the Rio Grande as possible. Riparian habitats are among the most productive and ecologically diverse habitats in North America. They provide the essential food and water for numerous species of migratory birds and other species. These same riparian habitats have suffered the greatest losses due to human development and are among the most endangered habitats in North America. The Rio Grande is the major north/south bird migration corridor in the western United States.</p> <p>Powerlines are notorious for killing and injuring birds, therefore the placement of this powerline is extremely important. Current science seems to indicate that the best location for the powerline is to run around the east side of White Sands Missile Range. It also suggests that all infrastructure be placed as far back from the river as possible. Since there is no “good” place for the powerline to cross the river, at the river and adjacent riparian habitat and all other sensitive habitat areas it should be placed underground.</p> <p>Detailed site specific bird data should be collected by independent researchers throughout the year, but especially during migration, before a final decision is made.</p>	Mesilla Valley Audubon Society
1330	<p>As a citizen of the state of New Mexico, I urge you not to move forward with developing transmission lines near the Bosque del Apache Wildlife Refuge. Please consider moving away from this beautiful area and sanctuary for birds while considering routes. A few weeks ago, I spent a weekend marking fence lines to prevent lesser prairie chickens from running into the wires. It would be very disappointing to me to hear that Sandhill Cranes and other birds might face similar problems from a new project.</p>	
1338	<p>The Middle Rio Grande Valley – Critical for Migratory Birds</p> <p>Audubon has concerns about the impacts of the SunZia transmission line on the Rio Grande, particularly with the Middle Rio Grande Valley and the specific route along New Mexico Highway 380, crossing the Rio Grande three miles north of the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge. Because of unacceptable impacts to migrating Sandhill Cranes and other important birds and wildlife, BLM should not select any routes crossing the Rio Grande near the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge or in the Middle Rio Grande Valley, unless environmental analysis shows that running the line underground in this area would</p>	Audubon New Mexico

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>sufficiently limit impacts.</p> <p>This latest round that expanded the Scoping/Study Area north to Belen, New Mexico does not adequately reduce or address the environmental impacts associated with a power and transmission line routed through the Middle Rio Grande Valley. Routes north of the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge will compromise the establishment purpose of the Bosque del Apache NWR and even the Ladd S. Gordon Waterfowl Complex managed by the New Mexico Department of Game &amp; Fish and could significantly harm the financial investments in habitat restoration and forage for birds made by the federal and state governments. Bosque del Apache NWR was established using the authority of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 712d) of 1936, to provide refuge and breeding grounds for migratory birds and other wildlife as well as incidental fish and wildlife-oriented recreational development, the protection of natural resources, and the conservation of endangered species or threatened species. Additional lands were added by Executive Order 82189 in November 1939.</p> <p>The Ladd S. Gordon Waterfowl Complex is a cooperative project between the New Mexico Department of Game &amp; Fish and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to feed and harbor migrating waterfowl along the Rio Grande corridor. Because of the importance to migrating and wintering ducks, geese, and cranes, this waterfowl complex was designated as an Important Bird Area in 2000. These refuges feed approximately one-half of the wintering waterfowl in the Middle Rio Grande Valley (NMDGF website at <a href="http://www.wildlife.state.nm.us/conservation/wildlife_management_areas/index.htm">http://www.wildlife.state.nm.us/conservation/wildlife_management_areas/index.htm</a>). Because of the The Belen Waterfowl Area is four miles south of Belen on New Mexico 109. This 230-acre farm grows corn and alfalfa for migrating waterfowl. The Casa Colorado Waterfowl Area comprised of 420 acres of cultivated crops is six miles south of Belen on New Mexico 304. The Bernardo Waterfowl Area is 17 miles south of Belen near Bernardo and straddles U.S. Highway 60. This property consists of more than 1,700 acres with 450 acres in cultivation and is open to the public on most days, with recent improvements for bird viewing and photography platforms. An auto tour loop and two short hiking trails also give visitors views of birds in fields and ponds. The La Joya Waterfowl Area is 22 miles south of Belen, just east of I-25 and consists of 3,500 acres containing 600 acres of man-made ponds to provide winter feed and resting areas.</p> <p>Located on the southern end of the Central Flyway and along the key migration corridor of the Rocky Mountain population of Sandhill Cranes, the Middle Rio Grande Valley, more specifically the Socorro reach of the valley, has been integral in the rebuilding and protection of this waterbird population. During the early 1900's the Rocky Mountain population of Sandhill Cranes numbers plummeted due to habitat alteration, land fragmentation, and human population growth (Taylor 1999). By the 1940's, the population was estimated to be fewer than 400 birds. Efforts to protect habitat, restore wetlands, and enhance existing natural and agricultural habitats in combination with sound population management practices helped the species recover to between 18,000 and 20,000 birds annually (Taylor 1999). Today along with the Rocky Mountain population cranes, the Middle Rio Grande Valley plays host to</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>hundreds of thousands of migrating and wintering waterbirds and countless breeding and migratory neotropical migrants and raptors including the endangered Southwestern Willow Flycatcher and the candidate species Yellow-billed Cuckoo.</p> <p>Audubon has heard there was a recent study initiated by SunZia to look at crane movements up and down the Middle Rio Grande Valley because of concerns expressed about the crossing north of Bosque del Apache. There appear to be gaps in the study design and Audubon and other migratory bird managers have little confidence that this study is going to provide us much in the way of understanding how cranes use the valley seasonally or daily.</p> <p><b>Minimize Impacts in Crossing Rio Grande</b></p> <p>Any crossing of the Rio Grande will entail significant impacts to migrating bird populations and other wildlife. The following recommendations may reduce impacts to cranes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Set transmission lines and associated infrastructure back from the edges of wetlands and croplands to allow for takeoff and landing by these large birds so that they do not have to pass through lines or facilities.</li> <li>2) Mark transmission lines with bird flight diverters or other markers so that they can be more easily seen and avoided by cranes. Powerlines marked with markers such as the yellow spiral vibration dampeners or yellow fiberglass swinging plates have been shown to reduce crane mortality by 54% to 63% in different studies. (Brown and Drewien 1995)</li> <li>3) Bury powerlines and transmission lines in areas where there is high crane use for roosting and foraging and likely potential for collision with takeoff and landings.</li> <li>4) Where feasible, turbines should be shut down during periods when birds are highly concentrated at those sites.</li> <li>5) Minimize roads, fences, and other infrastructure.</li> </ol>	
1343	<p>The Rio Grande may be the most important wildlife corridor in New Mexico. Many species of birds and butterflies migrate hundreds and thousands of miles up and down the Rio Grande. The Rio Grande and other important wildlife corridors in New Mexico are becoming increasingly fragmented and the NMWF along with many other agencies and organizations is committed to better understanding, documenting and protecting these corridors. Transmission lines crossing the Rio Grande will undoubtedly have significant impacts to migrating bird populations and other wildlife because they will physically bifurcate this passageway. Sandhill Cranes, waterfowl and other migrating birds could be deterred or snared by these lines strung across this corridor that has been in use since time immemorial. The electromagnetic field emanating from these lines may have additional impacts to wildlife. For these reasons, all the proposed crossings of the Rio Grande are problematic, especially the proposed route crossing at Highway 380 just north of Bosque del Apache.</p> <p>In our opinion, the best route for the SunZia line is on the east side of White Sands Missile Range. And where the SunZia line eventually</p>	New Mexico Wildlife Federation

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	crosses the Rio Grande, mitigation measures must be put in place that include avoidance of critical wetlands, riparian areas, and agricultural fields used for foraging. If at all possible we recommend burying the lines underground in areas that crane’s and other migratory birds roost and forage because of the potential for collision with takeoff and landings. BLM should require construction of underground transmission lines where proposed rights-of-way conflict with sensitive biological resources and military activities.	
1358	As a photographer, and lover of all nature, I oppose powerlines that would be hazardous to the migratory birdlife, and the beauty of Bosque del Apache. I am a winter visitor, who enjoys the beauty of the Socorro region. Please do your best to bypass the Bosque, to limit harm to the wildlife, and to protect the Rio Grande. There are so few natural areas left for our native birds and mammals. We, the public, are watching; and we care!	
1360	<p>We are certain that it would be economically more feasible to build your lines along existing highways and railroad lines. Do not destroy what little we have left. Please consider the following points and take your project to a more suitable location.</p> <p>The San Pedro River Valley supports the last major free flowing river in the desert southwest, the main migratory corridor for neo-tropical birds in the West, and the greatest diversity of mammal species in North America. The Rocky Mountains, Sierra Madres, Sonoran and Chihuahuan deserts all merge here to create the greatest biodiversity of any landlocked area in the U.S.</p>	
1368	<p>We have reviewed the route alternatives map and specifically recommend Route numbers A181 and A300 (or alternately, A250) as the Proposed Route for the SunZia DEIS.</p> <p>The route cuts diagonally west-southwest from the new sub-station north of Carrizozo, past the northwest corner of White Sands Missile Range (WSMR) property just south of Highway 380, where it turns immediately south, following the WSMR boundary to the point where the line must head west in order to cross the Rio Grande just south of Arrey, NM.</p> <p>There are several reasons that this route makes the most sense:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It passes through unpopulated federal lands and avoids populated agricultural and scenic areas.</li> <li>2. It avoids all National Wildlife Refuges, Wilderness Study Areas, existing Wilderness Areas, and Areas of Critical Environmental Concern. The study expansion in the middle Rio Grande Valley north of Socorro (from April 2010) makes no sense, as it considers news routes that include more private lands and rural population centers, and more of the Rio Grande waterfowl migratory flyway.</li> <li>3. It avoids the low-altitude migratory avian flyway along the Rio Grande. The Rio Grande Flyway is a critical migratory corridor for greater Sandhill Cranes and Snowgeese (among other species) that stretches from northern Canada (for the Snowgeese) and Grey Lake Idaho (for Sandhill Cranes) southward to Bosque del Apache NWR</li> </ol>	Rio Grande Agricultural Land Trust

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>south of Socorro, and this waterfowl population has been recognized to be negatively impacted in recent years by development and human encroachment. In fact, RGALT has been working since 2004 with the USFWS Intermountain West Joint Venture group using North American Wetlands Conservation Act (NAWCA1) grant funds to preserve habitat, including working farms in the middle Rio Grande Valley down to Bosque del Apache NWR. Constructing a powerline across this corridor would create yet another threat to the Rio Grande Flyway migrants.</p>	
1374	<p>In particular, we believe that siting of energy developments should avoid impacts on birds and wildlife and include appropriate stipulations regarding wildlife and avian resources inventory, mitigation, and monitoring, including the cumulative effects of expanded development in both space and time.</p> <p>The state and federal wildlife refuges and the associated managed agricultural crops along the Rio Grande, planted specifically for daily forage for wintering cranes and waterfowl, represent a significant investment in the middle Rio Grande Valley and these resources provide a critical landscape in the life cycle of many birds.</p> <p>In addition to these concerns about the Rio Grande Valley itself, we note that the mountain ranges just east of the Rio Grande represent an important corridor for migrating raptors, as documented by many years of raptor counts in the mountains southeast of Albuquerque. These mountain ranges funnel northbound migrating raptors north to the Rocky Mountain front.</p> <p>Our comments on the proposed SunZia Transmission Line are informed by these considerations and by the substantial body of science which demonstrates the hazards to resident and migratory birds from above-ground transmission power lines.</p> <p>We are particularly concerned that the proposed crossing of the SunZia Transmission Line just north of the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge will have an undue and avoidable impact on the rich wildlife resources of the Rio Grande Valley. Any crossing of the Rio Grande will entail significant impacts to migrating bird populations and other wildlife. The route crossing at Highway 380 just north of Bosque del Apache is particularly egregious in its effect on the Rocky Mountain population of Sandhill Cranes.</p> <p>We also have concerns about other possible crossing locations because of the likelihood with fatal collisions by Sandhill Cranes and other migratory birds. However we recognize that the line must cross at some point. Where the SunZia line crosses the Rio Grande, mitigation measures must be put in place that include avoidance of critical wetlands, marking of the transmission line with flight diverters or powerline markers, as well as burying the line underground where it crosses sensitive riparian areas where roosting and foraging create a high potential for collisions. BLM should require construction of underground transmission lines where proposed rights-of-way conflict with sensitive biological resources.</p>	Sangre de Cristo Audubon Society
1381	<p>San Pedro Valley</p> <p>This proposed route is also unacceptable and unreasonable and should be</p>	Sierra Club et. al.

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>removed from further consideration. The San Pedro River Valley supports one of the last major free-flowing rivers in the desert southwest and, as such, is important habitat for many species and a key migratory corridor for neo-tropical birds. It is a world-renowned birding area and an important tourist destination.</p> <p>Sevilleta and Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuges  Proposed routes across (E60/E70, E120) and adjacent to (E20, E100, E110, A102, A111, A130, A140, A160)) these two National Wildlife Refuge units are unacceptable due to high levels of conflict with sensitive resources and the conservation mission and goals of the National Wildlife Refuge System:</p> <p>“The Mission of the National Wildlife Refuge System is to administer a national network of lands and waters for the conservation, management, and where appropriate, restoration of the fish, wildlife, and plant resources and their habitats within the United States for the benefit of present and future generations of Americans.” The Rio Grande River is a well-documented bird migration corridor that could be impaired by aboveground high voltage transmission lines. The presence of transmission lines crossing this river corridor in or adjacent to these wildlife refuges present a serious conflict that would be difficult, if not impossible, to mitigate.</p>	
1389	<p>I have a major concern with the Transmission Line crossing one of the most critical flyways and bird sanctuaries in our country, the Bosque de Apache. What a national treasure. The potential impact is not worth the electricity delivered to AZ and CA.</p>	
1395	<p>Conservation Interests of Greatest Concern in New Mexico</p> <p>The middle Rio Grande Valley serves as one of the most important wildlife corridors for migrating and wintering waterfowl and waterbirds in the region. The several new proposed western routes are near, and in one case adjacent to, the Sevilleta National Wildlife Refuge. The Sevilleta NWR, much like the Bosque del Apache NWR, provides critical wintering and migratory stopover habitat for migrating waterfowl, Sandhill Cranes, and other species. We recognize that this new route was proposed in response to concerns about the transmission line location relative to the Bosque del Apache NWR and about defense activity and protection of the air space near White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base. However, the migratory waterfowl, cranes, and other species in this area need unrestricted movement on a daily basis up and down the middle Rio Grande Valley to access food, water, and shelter. The siting of overhead transmission lines across or within this highly concentrated flyway, be it near either NWR or the private lands between them, could have significant negative impacts on crane and goose populations through collisions, displacement from limited suitable habitat, and disturbance of well-established migratory patterns. Therefore, The Nature Conservancy opposes any route in the vicinity of Sevilleta National Wildlife Refuge.</p>	The Nature Conservancy

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
<b>CODE 072.00 Other Wildlife</b>		
880	As a former resident of Cascabel as well as a former preserve manager of the Muleshoe Ranch, I oppose the proposed routes for the transmission lines through the greater Cascabel area. This area is a rich Sonoran Desert ecosystem with desert tortoises, bighorn sheep, and a variety of other wildlife that would be impacted by the project. Please use existing disturbed corridors for the location of this project.	
892	Regarding sections A60, A90, and A80 – these proposed lines are within 3 miles of our headquarters/homes. My children are the 5th generation in my family to live on this ranch. We have approximately 1,200 acres of deeded land and I will not consider any easements or right of ways on my property. We border an environmental study area, so I see the reason to avoid that area. Frequently, Air Force jets and helicopters fly over the ranch, sometimes at about 40-50 ft altitude. We do have desert tortoise on the ranch.	
952	In particular, route C301 crosses directly over Willow Spring (which is not on the topo map, but is an important water for wildlife). Willow Spring is in Sierra Blanca Wash just downstream from Hackberry Spring and Sierra Blanca Spring, both of which are shown on the Soza Mesa 7.5 min Quad. Together the three springs form very important riparian habitat and make Sierra Blanca Wash an important wildlife corridor. After crossing Sierra Blanca Wash the line would go through a beautiful and unique basin which we call either the Notch Basin or Henderson Basin. This basin drains through an unusual geological feature we call the Notch into Pool Wash. C301 apparently would go either right through or adjacent to the notch. There are two other intermittent springs, not shown on the topo map (Cottonwood Spring and Muleshoe Spring) that enrich the entire area biologically. Essentially the entire area traversed by C301, C311, and C331 around Sierra Blanca Peak from Sierra Blanca Wash to Hot Springs Canyon is complicated geologically and rich biologically. It should be avoided in route selection. From there C331 crosses Hot Springs Canyon above the Yellow Cliffs in an area known as a nesting area for Black Hawks, a species which the BLM recognizes as a species of concern. Along the C321-C341 route is a strip of state land where we have a 10-acre saguaro study plot in which we have mapped and measured saguaros. We have found that it contains an exceptionally large number of small saguaros.	
1038	A section of C 170, where it crosses the northern end of the Galiuro Mountains, would negatively impact a considerable amount of roadless areas and is of particular concern to the Department. A route through this area would require substantive coordination with the Department on siting, construction by helicopter only, and mitigation to compensate for current and future damages to wildlife and habitat.	Arizona Game and Fish Department
1058	<i>New Mexico Expanded Study Area</i> The Service believes that either of the two alternative routes provided in the October 7,2009, expanded study area are preferable alternatives to any route that crosses the Rio Grande in the reach north of the Bosque	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>del Apache NWR and in the vicinity of the Sevilleta NWR. The crossings of the Rio Grande in the Las Cruces area and below Caballo Reservoir are in reaches of limited riparian habitat and less bird use of the Rio Grande corridor.</p> <p><i>Arizona Expanded Study Area</i></p> <p>The currently proposed Arizona transmission line alignments roughly parallel Interstate 10 from New Mexico westward to near Willcox or Benson, Arizona. At which point, different alignments are considered, including: (1) north along State Route (SR) 191 to near Safford, and then west, roughly paralleling U.S. Highway (US) 70 before traversing the Galiuro Mountains to enter the San Pedro River Valley near Aravaipa Creek; (2) various routes within the San Pedro River Valley; (3) a route skirting Tucson's eastern and northern areas, in and near the Pantano Wash and Rillito River area; and, (4) routes located generally south and west of the Tucson metropolitan area.</p> <p>The Service's concern with impacts to bats and migratory birds (e.g., raptors, waterfowl, and other large birds) is common to all potential [Arizona] routes listed above. Similarly, our concern with direct impacts to aquatic resources (via placement of structures and clearing of wetland and riparian-obligate vegetation and indirect impacts via sedimentation, elevated peak flows, and increased traffic) are common to all routes.</p> <p>Our primary concern with the SR 191-US 70-Galiuro Mountain route is that it traverses between the Galiuro and Santa Maria mountains near the headwaters of Aravaipa Creek. This area presently has limited road access, and we anticipate the placement of a transmission line through this region would necessitate impacting an appreciable acreage of currently wild lands. Aravaipa Creek currently supports seven species of native fishes including longfin dace (<i>Agosia chrysogaster</i>), roundtail chub (<i>Gila robusta</i>), speckled dace (<i>Rhinichthys osculus</i>), desert sucker (<i>Pantosteus clarkii</i>), Sonora sucker (<i>Catostomus insignis</i>), spikedace (<i>Medafulgida</i>), and loach minnow (<i>Tiaroga cobitis</i>), with Gila topminnow (<i>Poeciliopsis occidentalis occidentalis</i>) and desert pupfish (<i>Cyprinodon macularis</i>) present in the watershed. The latter four species are federally listed as threatened or endangered. Threatened Chiricahua leopard frogs (<i>Lithobates chiricahuensis</i>) occur in the eastern Galiuro Mountains. While relatively distant from the likely alignment, impacts to aquatic sites in the northern Galiuro Mountains could affect the ability for the species to expand its range northward.</p> <p>Transmission line construction and maintenance could affect the federally threatened Mexican spotted owl (<i>Strix occidentalis lucida</i>), which occurs not only in forested areas, but also at unusually low elevations in the expanded study area's canyons. Mexican spotted owl critical habitat exists in both the Galiuro and Santa Teresa mountains. We believe the Galiuro Mountains' north-south orientation east of the San Pedro River Valley may indicate that the range is used by southward migrating raptors in the autumn.</p> <p>The SR 191-US 70-Galiuro Mountain route also appears to traverse the lower slopes and foothills of the western Galiuro Mountains, an area supporting a robust community of saguaro cactus (<i>Carnegiea gigantea</i>). Saguaro cactus blossoms are a forage resource for the federally</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>endangered lesser long-nosed bat (<i>Leptonycteris yerbabuenae</i>), and the plants are a nest substrate for the cactus ferruginous pygmy-owl (<i>Glaucidium brasilianum cactorum</i>), formerly listed as federally endangered and currently under review by the Service. We would be concerned over the clearing of this habitat as well as the indirect effects of increased access and invasion by injurious, nonnative plants.</p> <p>As described in our March 11, 2010, memorandum, the SR 191-US 70-Galiuro Mountain route crosses the lower San Pedro River in a reach supporting: (1) critical habitat for the spikedace; (2) a large breeding population of southwestern willow flycatchers, including critical habitat; and, (3) substantial conservation lands, many of which were acquired specifically to conserve the latter species in perpetuity and promote their recovery. In addition, the Service is currently exploring the feasibility of establishing a new NWR on the lower San Pedro River.</p> <p>We anticipate that the Pantano Wash-Rillito River route would have appreciable impacts to aquatic, mesoriparian, and xeroriparian resources in the named streams. The Cienega Creek/Pantano Wash stream channel is critical habitat for the federally endangered Gila chub (<i>Gila intermedia</i>), and individuals of the species occur upstream. Endangered Gila topminnow have been documented at a diversion near where Pantano Wash enters the far eastern portions of Tucson. The federally endangered Huachuca water umbel (<i>Lilaeopsis schaffleriana</i> var. <i>recurva</i>) occurs upstream in Cienega Creek; the species could also persist in the perennial, shallow-water conditions at the diversion.</p> <p>We have documented the presence of a roost site for endangered lesser long-nosed bats in the foothills of the Santa Catalina Mountains, north of the Rillito River, and limited telemetry data appear to illustrate that the species uses the stream courses in question as routes to access hummingbird feeders in the Tucson metropolitan area during years of reduced saguaro cactus blossom availability.</p> <p>The potential routes that run south and west of Tucson may affect the federally endangered Pima pineapple cactus (<i>Coryphantha scheeri</i> var. <i>robustispina</i>) and, in areas containing saguaro cactus, lesser long-nosed bats. In areas west of Tucson within the western bajadas of the Tucson Mountains and in the vicinity of the Central Arizona Project Canal, we have concerns over the interruption of wildlife corridors that link the mountain ranges east and west of the Avra Valley.</p>	
1261	<p>Recently, I have been studying the bighorn sheep population in Aravaipa. This population has provided the largest hunter-harvested desert bighorn sheep ever. Human activity and habitat modification associated with the transmission lines would greatly impact this unique bighorn sheep population. In other words, if BLM recommends the Aravaipa route, I can also promise you large opposition from the hunting community.</p>	
1308	<p>It is the very lack of development and landscape fragmentation which has created the political upheaval in the Upper SPRY that really distinguishes the MSPRV. It is what strikes the eye of any visitor and even the most casual observer. "Spanning this reach of river is a nearly unfragmented landscape linking the Galiuro and Winchester mountains</p>	<p>Cascabel Working Group</p>

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

<b>ID</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>AFFILIATION</b>
	<p>with the Santa Catalina and Rincon mountains, which represents the narrowest intermountain distance between these ranges. Unfragmented landscapes are key indicators developed by biologists in assessing the conservation value of regions and sites and the imminence of the threat they face. "Large blocks of habitat have the potential to sustain viable species populations, and they permit a broader range of species and ecosystem dynamics to persist."</p> <p>Indeed, when large blocks of unfragmented landscape come together with extensive intact habitats in a region of significant biodiversity, a region may take on global significance. As we shall examine shortly, the renowned World Wildlife Fund assessment of terrestrial ecoregions gives the highest priority to "Globally or regionally outstanding ecoregions that present rare opportunities to conserve large blocks of intact habitat," which not incidentally includes the Chihuahuan Desert, Sonoran Desert, Arizona Mountains and Madrean Sky Islands ecoregions, all of which converge in the MSPRV.</p> <p>The distinctive virtue of the MSPRV is that in addition to all of the same biological attributes of the Upper SPR it flows within a relatively intact and largely unfragmented landscape.</p>	
1333	<p>Below are some comments I appreciate your taking into consideration regarding the NM Sun Zia Project. Since the Rio Grande River is the lifeblood for wildlife in New Mexico great care and consideration must be given to crossing this historically significant river with the power lines. This river is a corridor of huge importance that is at this time being partially restored to its former lush riparian habitat in the southern part of New Mexico after decades of human abuse in the past. There are areas on this river where Southwestern Willow Flycatchers occur as well as hundreds of Sandhill Cranes using it during the winter months. In fact, there are literally hundreds of bird species tied to this river. Riparians areas are magnets to a plethora of plants and animals all year long. This makes them critical to the wildlife tied to them.</p> <p>As we see climate change many renewable energy sources and conservation can help wildlife if site and constructed properly so they don't harm birds and other wildlife (bats and birds in the case of wind power).</p>	
1353	<p>We, the Aravaipa Property Owners Association (APOA), are writing you to express our strong and unanimous opposition to the Aravaipa transmission line route proposed by the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project. This route cuts through more than 20 miles of the Aravaipa Canyon watershed, crosses Aravaipa Creek on the east side of the Canyon, and bisects the Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness administered by the Bureau of Land Management to the north and Galiuro Wilderness in the Coronado National Forest to the south. Aravaipa Creek is a perennial creek in the Sonoran Desert that flows through the wilderness and the area in which the APOA members live. Aravaipa Creek is home to two federally threatened fish species, the spikedace and the loach minnow, and is the only watercourse in Arizona still to have all its' native fish species. Other species of special concern in the creek and nearby are four other fishes (longfin dace, roundtail chub, desert sucker, and</p>	Aravaipa Property Owners Association

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>Sonoran sucker), three bird species (yellow-billed cuckoo, gray hawk, and black hawk), the desert tortoise, and the desert bighorn sheep. In other words, Aravaipa Canyon and its watershed constitute a unique environment and an ecologically sensitive area. In fact, the Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness has been called the “crown jewel” of the wilderness areas administrated by BLM.</p> <p>Protection of the special aspects of this environment is a very high priority for APOA and the proposed transmission line route would threaten the Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness in a number of ways:</p> <p>(1) The proposed route would block the road-less wildlife migration corridor between the Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness and the Galiuro Wilderness in the Coronado National Forest, one of the last of this magnitude in the southwest. The importance of this 100-mile long corridor has not been taken into account because for some unknown reason the study area stops just north of the Galiuros and does not include the road-less areas to the north. This is an essential corridor for many animals, such as desert bighorn sheep, black bears, mountain lions, and mule deer, and it connects these two ecologically pristine areas. Overall, approximately 50 miles of the proposed route would pass through or within one mile of areas determined to be environmentally sensitive, the largest number of miles in this category of all the transmission line routes, proposed or alternative. More importantly, once the transmission lines are in place with their attendant maintenance access, they will act like a “gateway drug” to further access, first by off-road vehicles, then to more development and degradation.</p> <p>(2) The proposed route would cross or closely parallel Aravaipa Creek on the east side of the wilderness and cross the Aravaipa Creek watershed for much of its length, potentially destroying and altering habitat important to native species.</p>	
1360	<p>Please consider the following points in determining the location of your power lines. We live in Redington, west of the river. We are 3rd and 4th generation landowners here. The San Pedro Valley is a rarity as is Aravaipa.</p> <p>Canyons crossed by the power corridor are major habitat for native fish, the most endangered of all classes of animals in the southwest, which will be adversely impacted by sedimentation and other water quality issues.</p> <p>The San Pedro River Valley is home to many raptors, including relatively rare ones such as Black Hawks, Grey Hawks, Zone-tails and Peregrine Falcons. Transmission lines have been demonstrated to negatively impact raptors, and mitigation is both and uncertain.</p> <p>Aravaipa Canyon, a major tributary to the San Pedro, is also very undeveloped and remote, provides critical habitat for several species of endangered native fish and birds, and is located among several designated wilderness areas and national forests.</p>	
1365	<p>The environmental and ecological impacts to the area must be considered and addressed. A transmission line between Socorro and Belen will pose a hazard to the daily flight patterns of sandhill cranes, snow geese, and other water fowl. It will also pose a migratory pathway</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>hazard for other birds. The riverine environment of the refuge along the Rio Grande River has led to an increased biological diversity due to a landscape that has been managed for minimal disturbance to allow for a biodiverse habitat. As an example, elk, deer, and turkey are with their own migratory patterns now becoming common to the bosque. A new route must be provided to relieve concerns regarding wildlife and its habitat.</p>	
1381	<p>Aravaipa Creek supports a lush riparian community and provides important habitat for numerous species of wildlife, including various species of bats, coatimundi, leopard frogs, and mountain lions, among many others. A 17-mile stretch of Aravaipa Creek is perennial and provides some of the best native fish habitat in Arizona, supporting seven species of native fish, including the federally listed threatened spikedace and loach minnow. Although the upper and lower portions of the creek are intermittent and ephemeral, they continue to support important riparian vegetation and provide habitat for many wildlife species.</p> <p>According to the BLM, more than 150 species of birds have been documented in the Aravaipa Wilderness, including the peregrine falcon, common black-hawk, bald eagle, cactus ferruginous pygmy-owl, and southwestern willow flycatcher.</p> <p>The San Pedro River Valley supports one of the last major free-flowing rivers in the desert southwest and, as such, is important habitat for many species and a key migratory corridor for neo-tropical birds. It is a world-renowned birding area and an important tourist destination. The San Pedro also supports the greatest diversity of mammal species in North America, including mountain lion, black bear, coatimundi, javelina, fox, coyote, badger, three skunk species, mule and white-tail deer, ringtail cat, raccoon, bobcat, beaver, porcupine, black-tailed prairie dog and 24 species of bats as well as many other smaller or lesser known mammal species. In addition, the San Pedro River Valley provides habitat for a great diversity of avifauna and is an important migratory flyway.</p> <p><b>Construction Impacts</b></p> <p>Every attempt should be made to avoid sensitive lands, important wildlife habitat, special status plants, and archaeological sites during construction. Many significant impacts from electric transmission lines occur during construction. Each of the towers requires grading, vegetation removal, and placement of a large concrete footing for the tower itself.</p> <p>During construction, impacts include the following: soil disturbance and eradication of plant communities; disturbance of ground-dwelling species including amphibians, mammals, and groundnesting birds; soil erosion; interference with large mammals such as pronghorn, elk, and deer that prefer locations distant from roads; and interference with birds and bats, whether migrating or not.</p>	Sierra Club et. al.

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1399	The area in question is also a very fragile and quite unique environmentally. For example, the Sonoran Tiger Salamander is thought to be found in some of the arroyos in the area.	Anam Inc./Willow Springs Ranch (AZ)
<b>CODE 073.00 Aquatic</b>		
1030	<p>My husband and I live less than a mile from where Sunzia wants to put a transmission line. We live on the North end of Bosquecito Road near Quebradas Road.</p> <p>The Rio Grande River from Cochiti Lake to Elephant Butte is critical habitat for the Silver Minnow and the Southwest Willow Flycatcher as well as the Bald Eagle that winters in the Rio Grande area.</p>	
1058	<p>The currently proposed Arizona transmission line alignments roughly parallel Interstate 10 from New Mexico westward to near Willcox or Benson, Arizona. At which point, different alignments are considered, including: (1) north along State Route (SR) 191 to near Safford, and then west, roughly paralleling U.S. Highway (US) 70 before traversing the Galiuro Mountains to enter the San Pedro River Valley near Aravaipa Creek; (2) various routes within the San Pedro River Valley; (3) a route skirting Tucson's eastern and northern areas, in and near the Pantano Wash and Rillito River area; and, (4) routes located generally south and west of the Tucson metropolitan area.</p> <p>The Service's concern with impacts to bats and migratory birds (e.g., raptors, waterfowl, and other large birds) is common to all potential routes listed above. Similarly, our concern with direct impacts to aquatic resources (via placement of structures and clearing of wetland and riparian-obligate vegetation and indirect impacts via sedimentation, elevated peak flows, and increased traffic) are common to all routes.</p> <p>Our primary concern with the SR 191-US 70-Galiuro Mountain route is that it traverses between the Galiuro and Santa Maria mountains near the headwaters of Aravaipa Creek. This area presently has limited road access, and we anticipate the placement of a transmission line through this region would necessitate impacting an appreciable acreage of currently wild lands. Aravaipa Creek currently supports seven species of native fishes including longfin dace (<i>Agosia chrysogaster</i>), roundtail chub (<i>Gila robusta</i>), speckled dace (<i>Rhinichthys osculus</i>), desert sucker (<i>Pantosteus clarkii</i>), Sonora sucker (<i>Catostomus insignis</i>), spikedace (<i>Medafulgida</i>), and loach minnow (<i>Tiaroga cobitis</i>), with Gila topminnow (<i>Poeciliopsis occidentalis occidentalis</i>) and desert pupfish (<i>Cyprinodon macularis</i>) present in the watershed. The latter four species are federally listed as threatened or endangered. Threatened Chiricahua leopard frogs (<i>Lithobates chiricahuensis</i>) occur in the eastern Galiuro Mountains.</p> <p>As described in our March 11, 2010, memorandum, the SR 191-US 70-Galiuro Mountain route crosses the lower San Pedro River in a reach supporting: (1) critical habitat for the spikedace; (2) a large breeding population of southwestern willow flycatchers, including critical habitat; and, (3) substantial conservation lands, many of which were acquired specifically to conserve the latter species in perpetuity and promote their</p>	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>recovery.</p> <p>We anticipate that the Pantano Wash-Rillito River route would have appreciable impacts to aquatic, mesoriparian, and xeroriparian resources in the named streams. The Cienega Creek/Pantano Wash stream channel is critical habitat for the federally endangered Gila chub (<i>Gila intermedia</i>), and individuals of the species occur upstream. Endangered Gila topminnow have been documented at a diversion near where Pantano Wash enters the far eastern portions of Tucson. The federally endangered Huachuca water umbel (<i>Lilaeopsis schaffleriana</i> var. <i>recurva</i>) occurs upstream in Cienega Creek; the species could also persist in the perennial, shallow-water conditions at the diversion.</p>	
1353	<p>We, the Aravaipa Property Owners Association (APOA), are writing you to express our strong and unanimous opposition to the Aravaipa transmission line route proposed by the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project. This route cuts through more than 20 miles of the Aravaipa Canyon watershed, crosses Aravaipa Creek on the east side of the Canyon, and bisects the Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness administered by the Bureau of Land Management to the north and Galiuro Wilderness in the Coronado National Forest to the south. Aravaipa Creek is a perennial creek in the Sonoran Desert that flows through the wilderness and the area in which the APOA members live. Aravaipa Creek is home to two federally threatened fish species, the spikedace and the loach minnow, and is the only watercourse in Arizona still to have all its' native fish species. Other species of special concern in the creek and nearby are four other fishes (longfin dace, roundtail chub, desert sucker, and Sonoran sucker), three bird species (yellow-billed cuckoo, gray hawk, and black hawk), the desert tortoise, and the desert bighorn sheep. In other words, Aravaipa Canyon and its watershed constitute a unique environment and an ecologically sensitive area.</p>	Aravaipa Property Owners Association
1381	<p>A 17-mile stretch of Aravaipa Creek is perennial and provides some of the best native fish habitat in Arizona, supporting seven species of native fish, including the federally listed threatened spikedace and loach minnow. Although the upper and lower portions of the creek are intermittent and ephemeral, they continue to support important riparian vegetation and provide habitat for many wildlife species.</p> <p>Further road-building, construction, and improved off-road vehicle access in this area will also contribute to erosion and sedimentation that could travel downstream through tributaries and impact threatened native fish populations and other species in Aravaipa Canyon, over 20 of which are designated with some sort of special status.</p>	Sierra Club et. al.
<b>CODE 074.00 Vegetation/Grasslands</b>		
931	<p>Re: segments F100, F104, F350, F410, F400, F360, F330, F340, F420, F430, F450, F440 F432</p> <p>I object to the siting of any proposed transmission lines relating to the Sunzia Southwest Project through the 13 above-listed areas. I live in the area that would be impacted. It is the most ecologically unique and rare saguaro forest in the world.</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1007	<p>We are ranchers that live on the path of the proposed E90 route, running south off routes E80 and E100. We own and operate this 30 section ranch and it provides our major source of income. The headquarters is at 34.4°50.8'N, 106.30°33.6'W. The E90 route is shown to run through our front yard, as well as through our BLM and NM State land leases.</p> <p>These power lines are environmentally objectionable because they will disrupt Native American home sites going back several hundred years, the homestead sites of the early pioneers who first came to this valley in the late 1800's and the activities of the current ranchers who have invested their time and resources into preserving and improving these grasslands while producing wholesome food.</p>	
1038	<p>General Comments</p> <p>Permanent or temporary construction/service roads and staging areas, needed to support the proposed transmission line, could have a substantive negative impact on wildlife and habitat. The use of existing roads is preferable over creating new roads. All new roads and staging areas should be kept to a minimum, restored to original condition (e.g., regarded, revegetated) if not needed for future service, and secured (e.g., fenced, gates) to prevent unauthorized traffic. Roads fragment habitat, disrupt wildlife movement patterns, contribute to soil loss through erosion, facilitate the spread of nonnative and invasive species, and provide new access points for off highway vehicle (OHV) traffic into previously undisturbed habitat. Disturbed areas should be reseeded with vegetation native to the site, utilizing seed collected from the project area to maintain the genetic integrity.</p> <p>The removal or pruning of vegetation during construction and for maintenance purposes should be avoided or minimized. In most cases, pruning is preferable to removable.</p>	Arizona Game and Fish Department
1058	<p>The SR 191-US 70-Galiuro Mountain route also appears to traverse the lower slopes and foothills of the western Galiuro Mountains, an area supporting a robust community of saguaro cactus (<i>Carnegia gigantea</i>). Saguaro cactus blossoms are a forage resource for the federally endangered lesser long-nosed bat (<i>Leptonycteris yerbabuenae</i>), and the plants are a nest substrate for the cactus ferruginous pygmy-owl (<i>Glaucidium brasilianum cactorum</i>), formerly listed as federally endangered and currently under review by the Service. We would be concerned over the clearing of this habitat as well as the indirect effects of increased access and invasion by injurious, nonnative plants.</p> <p>The potential routes that run south and west of Tucson may affect the federally endangered Pima pineapple cactus (<i>Coryphantha scheeri</i> var. <i>robustispina</i>) and, in areas containing saguaro cactus, lesser long-nosed bats.</p>	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1248	<p>Though population densities are low between Socorro and Belen, tourism and land values are tied to the unique views of the rolling hills of Sevilleta National Wildlife Refuge, the majesty of "M" Mountain, and the cottonwood gallery along the Rio Grande.</p>	
1308	<p>With regard to the great extent of the [San Pedro River] valley which is rangeland, the data indicate that about 40% of the rangeland is in high or</p>	Cascabel Working

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>very high similarity to the historic condition. In other words, the species present and the proportions making up those species are fairly similar to presumed "historic" conditions for the site. Moderate similarity was found on 53% of the area, indicating either different species occurred or, more likely, the species deviated from the "historic" proportions. This probably indicates shrub increases in most cases. Only 7% were in low similarity.</p> <p>... there is general agreement that overall range and watershed condition has improved greatly since the early 1900s and especially since the 1950s. Numbers of livestock have declined dramatically and management (pasture rotation, distribution of grazing) has greatly improved ... Other than roads, there is probably less human impact on the vegetation of the watersheds now than at any other time since settlement.</p> <p>Similarly, riparian woodland areas along the SPR and its valley tributaries have continued to be maintained or improved to relatively intact status.</p> <p>The Muleshoe CMA has an active prescribed burn program in which neighboring ranches have participated with good results. Pima County's A-7 Ranch also has a fire management plan.</p> <p>Since relatively intact, lower elevation riparian woodland is now extremely rare throughout the Sky Island region, it is altogether appropriate to state that "There are few places remaining in the southwestern U.S. that are as intact and have the quality and extent of aquatic and riparian habitat as that found on the San Pedro River."</p>	Group
1396	<p>Altar Valley, Santa Cruz River Valley and Avra Valley Transmission Line Corridor</p> <p>We also have significant concerns that this route would require additional habitat impacts during and after construction that would potentially impact large acreages of endangered Pima Pineapple cactus habitat.</p>	Pima County (AZ)
<b>CODE 075.00 Invasive Species</b>		
946	<p>If you put up power lines in Cascabel, it will make more places erode, kill a lot of birds and let invasive species in. Cascabel won't be Cascabel if you put your power lines up in it.</p>	
1038	<p>Permanent or temporary construction/service roads and staging areas, needed to support the proposed transmission line, could have a substantive negative impact on wildlife and habitat. The use of existing roads is preferable over creating new roads. All new roads and staging areas should be kept to a minimum, restored to original condition (e.g., regarded, revegetated) if not needed for future service, and secured (e.g., fenced, gates) to prevent unauthorized traffic. Roads fragment habitat, disrupt wildlife movement patterns, contribute to soil loss through erosion, facilitate the spread of nonnative and invasive species, and provide new access points for off highway vehicle (OHV) traffic into previously undisturbed habitat. Disturbed areas should be reseeded with vegetation native to the site, utilizing seed collected from the project area to maintain the genetic integrity.</p>	Arizona Game and Fish Department

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1381	<p>Construction of a large transmission line involves developing temporary construction roads as well as a permanent road under the line. This causes significant habitat fragmentation and invites off-road vehicles. Roads and motorized uses can have serious detrimental effects on habitats and wildlife.</p> <p>These effects include direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts, ranging from mortality from collisions with vehicles, modification of animal behaviors, altered use of habitats, facilitation of the spread of exotic, invasive, and parasitic species, adverse genetic effects, and fragmentation of connected habitats.</p>	Sierra Club et. al.
<b>CODE 080.00 Cultural Resources</b>		
906	The Avra Valley is chock full of archeological sites, many of them unique, and wildlife.	
909	I am a conservation land owner in the San Pedro River Valley. The cultural, environmental and eco-economic resources of the San Pedro far outweigh any value 2 500kV lines might provide the area, or state. Irreplaceable archeology would be lost.	
912	As several other commentators have noted, I support the development of facilities which make feasible the connection of renewable fuel-generated electricity to the electric network. However, transmission lines have many adverse impacts. Thus, the proposed line should be located in areas of least environmental and cultural impact; in particular, avoid San Pedro Valley.	
949	<p>Power transmission lines may be necessary for future but it would be better to run power lines along existing roadways instead of ruining pristine landscapes or natural habitats and archeological interests.</p> <p>We would think the power lines should go along existing utility easements and power transmission lines at a minimum impact on the environment. The F-20 path along the railroad or F-30 along the highway seem to be most logical.</p>	
1002	<p>Re: Study Routes E-80 and E-10 in Socorro and Torrance Counties (Mountainair, NM) Even route E-10 is near a pipeline and other improvements. Placing the lines along E-80 shows no regard to the aesthetic, natural or cultural condition of the land:</p> <p>1. Indian ruins, petroglyphs and complete pueblos will be crossed by routes E-80 and E-10; 2. There are several Spanish sheepherder ruins along the routes in E-80 and E-10; 4. Route E-80 comes near to the historic Spanish village of Chupadero (of which our ranch is a part) where the ruin of the Catholic Church still stands.</p>	
1007	<p>We are ranchers that live on the path of the proposed E90 route, running south off routes E80 and E100.</p> <p>[T]hese power lines are environmentally objectionable because they will disrupt Native American home sites going back several hundred years, the homestead sites of the early pioneers who first came to this valley in the late 1800's and the activates of the current ranchers who have</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	invested their time and resources into preserving and improving these grasslands while producing wholesome food.	
1015	My wife and I purchased property in Deer Canyon near Mountain, NM. This project appears to invade that area. We never would have purchased if this project was known. It will substantially decrease our property value. The project appears to be close proximity to Abo and Grana Quivira part of Salinas, NM. The appearance will be a further scar of modern society and a sign of disrespect for our American heritage. I respectfully request that the expansion area avoid these areas.	
1025	I am an Arizona native from Tucson, and have recently bought land in High Point Ranch 8 Miles south of Klondyke, AZ. There are approx 66 sections of land with no water, electric, gas, or phone lines to the properties, and minimal traffic. We do not organize as a homeowner association until June 19, 2010, so you have not heard from approx 66 new land owners about our views on a by way with tall transmission towers, road construction, possible dense housing for the workers and all of the new businesses that would follow, just to bring power from New Mexico to Casa Grande to benefit California, Utah, Las Vegas, etc. This cheap land is pristine and has always since the 1800's been very sparsely populated and should be for many reasons – for Indian sites, riparian areas, clean air, little crime, dark skies, for astronomy.	
1084	Routes currently proposed [in Tucson area] by SunZia would run lines over a historic neighborhood or adjacent to a National Park which blatantly overlooks the historic, ecological, and wilderness values of southern Arizona.	
1110	<p>I. Consider Pima County Priority Cultural Resources Pima County has recently identified a set of “Priority Cultural Resources” areas as part of the County’s Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan. Impacts to these significant cultural areas must be considered in analyses of new alignments proposed for the Tucson Basin. Early consultation with interested parties, such as Pima County, per the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) will help to ensure that cultural resource values are thoroughly considered in the planning process, and will help avoid any late surprises with respect to cultural resources.</p> <p>II. Use Existing Information to Identify and Remove Routes with Known Impacts to Significant Cultural Resources. [W]e draw your attention to the following line segments: C170, C400, C420, C430, C440, C443, C450, C460, C530, C540, C590, C790, F450, F461, F470, and F440. These routes, in particular, traverse cultural resource priority areas that have already been identified by CDA and despite the information provided no removal or re-alignment of these linkages has occurred since the beginning of the scoping process.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove line segments C170, C400, C420, C430, C440, C443, C450, C460, C530, C540, C590, C790, F450, F461, F470, and F440 from further project consideration.</li> </ul> <p>III. Remove the Lower San Pedro and Upper Aravaipa areas of Arizona</p>	The Center for Desert Archaeology; National Trust for Historic Preservation

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>from Project Consideration. We consider the impacts to cultural resources in these areas to be unacceptable under any “mitigation” scenario, so we strongly encourage you to drop these alignments from further consideration.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove all alignments through the Lower San Pedro and Upper Aravaipa areas of Arizona from consideration for the proposed project.</li> </ul> <p>IV. Remove the Alignments North of New Mexico’s Bosque del Apache from Project Consideration</p> <p>Similarly, alignments located north of the Bosque del Apache in central New Mexico would have unacceptable impacts to cultural resource values. For example, high potential route segments of El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro National Historic Trail—whose preservation is vital for maintaining the trail’s integrity—could be impacted. This is especially true for the “new” alignments” proposed for consideration since our letter of August 27, 2009. These travel through areas of great cultural significance and pose unacceptable risks to these resources and should be dropped from further consideration.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove all alignments located north of the Bosque del Apache from consideration for the proposed project.</li> </ul>	
1121	<p>To be feasible, the alternative route proposed through the city [Tucson] will require very careful and potentially difficult negotiations with the Tohono O’odham Nation, the city of Tucson, and Pima County, each of whom is likely to object strongly to it, at least initially.</p>	
1225	<p>I am a member of the Board of Directors of Apaches of Aravaipa Canyon, Inc., a 501 (c) (3) dedicated to conserving and interpreting the natural and historic site of what has been called the Camp Grant Massacre.</p> <p>This site, which occupies some 200 acres in the Aravaipa wilderness, once served as the home base of the Aravaipa Apache, whose name in Apache is in fact is taken from the Canyon's black rocks. As you can imagine, the Aravaipa wilderness is very sacred to the Apache people.</p> <p>As the site too of a terrible massacre carried out against Apache women, children and elders, it also has an important historic dimension for the Apache people – and for the people of the United States as a whole, as the event was to have a profound impact on our relations with Native peoples and shape who we later become as a nation.</p> <p>Having giant transmission lines run near the Canyon would irreparably harm the pristine nature of the site and in so doing destroy its historic character and beyond that degrade the sacred burial site, where the bodies of the 200 Apache civilians slain during the massacre still lie.</p> <p>The fact that Aravaipa remains a "wilderness" is something of a rarity and worthy of special consideration. In preserving its natural beauty, we preserve its sacred cultural and historic character as well.</p>	Apaches of Aravaipa Canyon, Inc.
1227	<p>Our property lies in the southwest corner of Torrance County [Mountainair, NM].</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>There are several archeological sites in the vicinity. Will a cultural clearance be done to make sure none of these sites are disturbed? Our property lies between Gran Quivera and Abo National Monuments. Native American's roamed around hunting trading etc, there are artifacts essentially everywhere.</p>	
1231	<p>[S]everal of the Tucson area routes proposed by SunZia contained obvious fatal flaws, such as running lines over a historic neighborhood or adjacent to a National Park.</p>	
1260	<p>I am writing to voice my objection to the proposed use of the Aravaipa Valley as a corridor for power lines. This is a sacred area to the Apache people who still own land allotments in this valley. It is the site of the Camp Grant Massacre and a National Historical Landmark where 120 Apache women and children (victims of the Camp Grant Massacre) are buried on the Mesa top.</p>	<p>Apaches of Aravaipa Canyon, Inc.</p>
1276	<p>I write to register my deep concern about the possibility of transmission lines from the Sun Zia Project being run through Aravaipa Canyon in Arizona. This is an extremely rare and fragile ecology. Moreover, it is a site of unparalleled historical import, containing the remains of O'odham villages, a U.S. Army fort, and several Western Apache sites (including the site of the Camp Grant Massacre, one of the most important, if less known, historic sites in Arizona history). It would be a tremendous tragedy to damage this location any further.</p>	
1308	<p>Historic and Cultural Resources (cursory)</p> <p>There is sufficient cultural and historic material in the MSPRV to fill several books, as indeed it already has. NEPA defines the EIS purview as the "human environment", thus implicating these cultural and sociological resources along with natural ones. Indeed it is made explicit when stated that "Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources..." should be considered in evaluating "intensity" of impacts.</p> <p>As the Muleshoe Ecosystem Management Plan and Environmental Assessment summarized, "Human occupation of what is now the Muleshoe Ecosystem may stretch back some 12,000 years. This is evidenced by projectile points being unearthed in mammoth remains just south of the MSPRV. "Today the San Pedro River Valley contains one of the highest concentrations of Paleo properties in the nation. The Middle SPRY is particularly rich in archaeological sites with a great complexity of periods and cultures represented. CDA [Center for Desert Archaeology] and other researchers have identified over 500 archaeological sites in the lower San Pedro Valley. About one third of these sites contain architecture and probably human remains. Furthermore, at least 40 sites were villages inhabited by 100 to 250 people for a century or more and they are marked today by rich archaeological deposits that include thousands of ancient houses and scores of public structures such as ballcourts and platform mounds, as well as large burial areas.</p> <p>Though scientists shy away from grandiose proclamations, it has been said that the SPRV contains the longest continuous archaeological</p>	<p>Cascabel Working Group</p>

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>record in the continental U.S., and rivaled in North America only by the Bering Straits. What such a plethora of archaeological sites affirms is the longstanding human importance of the MSPRV quite beyond any claims of modern scientists.</p>	
1310	<p>I am particularly concerned with the route proposed as E80, E90 &amp; E100. The proposed line would also pass thru an archaeologically rich area west from Gran Quivira and also thru many homesteads settled in the early 1900s. What sort of impact is anticipated from the proposed line or lines?</p>	
1345	<p>One National Historic Trail, the El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro National Historic Trail would be crossed by any alternative proposed for the SunZia Transmission Line. This trail, managed by the BLM and NPS in partnership with the Camino Real Trail Association, should be considered in the EIS for impact evaluation and mitigation.</p> <p>NPS has direct affiliation with many Tribal nations in proximity to park units and with many of those same Tribes' lands located within the Study Area. NPS has not observed notification or consultation with the Tribes on the potential transmission line, especially for the expanded Study Area. We would appreciate BLM providing feed-back to us and other concerned participants regarding the consultations with our affiliated tribes for the EIS scoping comments.</p> <p><b>Casa Grande Ruins National Monument</b> Potential Impact: Visual impacts that the proposed above-ground transmission lines will have to visitor experience at the Ruins. The purpose of the park is to preserve the ancient ruins of the Hohokam Culture and interpret those resources for park visitors.</p> <p><b>Salinas Pueblo Missions National Monument</b> Potential Impact: Visual impacts that the proposed above-ground lines will have on Gran Quivira's historic view shed. Gran Quivira was the sixth National Monument designated in the United States and is eligible for the National Register as a National Historic Landmark (NHL) under all eligibility criteria, exhibiting exceptional integrity.... The proposed placement of either of these nearby transmission line routes would constitute an adverse action under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (under Criteria of Effect 36 CFR, § 800.5 a5 as an introduction of visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features) to the core significance of Gran Quivira.</p> <p><b>White Sands National Park</b> Potential Impact: Visual impacts of an alternative transmission line approximately 2.5 miles from the park's entrance and National Register-listed visitor center and historic district. White Sands National Monument's visitor center is an outstanding example of Pueblo Revival architecture, blending national park and Southwest architectural styles. The visitor center is a part of a National Register-listed historic district that comprises a total of eight buildings, including the visitor center, three employee residences, and maintenance buildings, all in the same</p>	National Park Service

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>area and likely within sight of the proposed transmission line. The buildings were constructed by the Works Progress Administration from 1936-37, and they retain their historical integrity today. The proposed placement of a nearby transmission line would constitute an adverse action under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (under Criteria of Effect 36 CFR, § 800.5 a5 as an introduction of visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features) to the core significance of the visitor center and historic district.</p> <p>National Historic Trails</p> <p>Potential Impacts: Visual and Visitor Experience. The El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro National Historic Trail is the longest and oldest of European roads in North America, traversing 407 miles north-south in central New Mexico. Any alternative of the transmission line is likely to cross this trail at least once, potentially impacting the visual resources and visitor experience of this important historic and cultural resource.</p>	
1381	<p>A transmission project of the size proposed by SunZia and its related construction and maintenance access routes will greatly increase unauthorized traffic in the area which will also increase the risk of looting and vandalism to these prehistoric sites.</p>	Sierra Club et. al.
1396	<p>Altar Valley, Santa Cruz River Valley and Avra Valley Transmission Line Corridor.</p> <p>The SunZia Southwest Transmission project has identified several alternative routes through Avra Valley, Santa Cruz River Valley and Avra Valley subject to a feasibility study that may impact the County's Tucson Mountain Park and/or the Tucson Mitigation Corridor and significant cultural resources in these areas.</p> <p>Issues of concern regarding Routes F100, F104, F330, F340, F350, F360 and others in this area, as identified on the SunZia May 2010 Arizona Land Use Resources Map are as follows:</p> <p>Santa Cruz River Valley and Altar Valley Routes</p> <p>The Santa Cruz Valley is archaeologically rich, with prehistoric and historic sites densely distributed throughout the valley forming concentrations of sites associated with the river and its major tributaries, including from south to north, Julian Wash, West Branch Santa Cruz, Rillito River, and Canada Del Oro. Some of the larger, extremely significant and vulnerable prehistoric sites associated with the Santa Cruz River system include, from south to north, Julian Wash, West Branch, Hodges Ruin, Sunset Mesa, Los Morteros, and the Huntington Ruin. For example, the proposed route extending northward along the Santa Cruz River from the Irvington Road Substation potentially crosses numerous prehistoric sites, ranging from very large Hohokam villages, like Valencia Site, West Branch Site, and Julian Wash Site, to sites with important Archaic Period and Early Agricultural Period components, such as the Wetlands, Los Pozos, and Rillito Fan sites.</p> <p>Route F290 cuts across State grazing leases that the County manages for conservation as part of the Diamond Bell Ranch purchase. As stated in my letter regarding the San Pedro River Valley proposed route, it is the</p>	Pima County (AZ)

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>County's intent to acquire State Trust lands associated with our ranch acquisitions for long-term conservation. A large utility corridor would impact the effectiveness of those lands for conservation. We also have significant concerns that this route would require additional habitat impacts during and after construction that would potentially impact large acreages of endangered Pima Pineapple cactus habitat. The northern Altar Valley could be affected by a proposed route that portions of Brawley Wash, which contains rich concentrations of prehistoric and historic sites. Several important concentrations of sites have been identified in the SDCP as Priority Archaeological Site Complexes, including Gunsight PASC, southwest of the San Xavier Reservation lands, and Brawley Batamote PASC to the west-northwest of San Xavier lands. The Cocoraque Butte Complex, which includes important Archaic Period rock art and habitation components, also could be affected.</p> <p>Cienega Valley Transmission Line Corridor</p> <p>Many historic resources are in the Cienega Creek and Rincon Creek areas, containing numerous important prehistoric sites and other historic resources marking milestones in the history of ranching in Pima County.</p>	
1398	<p>RE: (Proposed Alternate corridor routes #1 and #1A: 2 routes that would directly cross our land: 1) S. of Belen traveling SE to SunZia East substation along the natural gas pipeline easements or 1A) along the Sevilleta National Wildlife Refuge and US Hwy 60 traveling East to the pipeline route and then following the pipelines easements SE to SunZia East substation.</p> <p>Our ranch encompasses part of the historic Abo Pass. There are historic ruins on several parts of our ranch, as well as the adjacent pass area. US HWY 60 passes through this Abo Pass landscape that has such substantial historical significance. Proposed alternate route #1 for this project would cross US HWY 60 and would be visible from the highway for miles. Proposed alternate route #1A would parallel US HWY 60 along the Northern border of the Sevilleta National Wildlife Refuge for several miles before joining proposed route #1 running SE to the SunZia East Substation and would be visible for miles along the highway. The transmission line project would clearly affect and diminish the historic view sheds that relate to this Abo Pass area.</p> <p>In 2003, NM State Representative Don Tripp, introduced legislation asking the NM State Office of Cultural Affairs to nominate US HWY 60 to the NM State Register of Cultural Properties and National Register of Historic Places. In 2004, Rep. Tripp asked for national legislation to designate US HWY 60 as a National Historic Highway. US Hwy 60 through our area is currently called a "scenic byway" on road maps. These proposed transmission line routes through this area are clearly inappropriate, in that they do not lend themselves to blend in with the surroundings. By definition, they will stick out like a sore thumb and detract radically from the historic view sheds that these legislative actions are designed to protect and preserve in their current condition.</p>	
1399	<p>There is also historic value to the proposed site north of Oracle, Az., aside from the house as mentioned by Ms. Saksen. Indian Burial grounds have been found within a quarter mile of the proposed</p>	Anam Inc./Willow Springs Ranch (AZ)

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

<b>ID</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>AFFILIATION</b>
	transmission line. There are petro glyphs and other precious artifacts that could be devastated and lost forever by the sweeping line. Also, cultural and visual resources will be compromised by these 16 story tall structures that the views of the developable deeded land will ruined for any future development.	
1403	Some examples of the historical significan[ce] of the ranch are many and varied: 1- Original historic Rayo Post Office established in 1916 (Now our family house) 2- 100 yr old shipping and dipping vat for sheep of the area 3- original adobe and rock house built in about 1912, used by my son 4- remnants of old homesteads throughout ranch 5- gravesites of original settler 6- cedar post corrals 100 year old and still used	
<b>CODE 090.00 Water Resources</b>		
881	SunZia lines should be kept out of the San Pedro Valley. New power transmission corridors should instead be placed along already established rail and highway corridors. The construction and maintenance of the proposed SunZia transmission lines would impact water and wildlife resources in SE Arizona, already under stress, and undermine property values and eco-tourism opportunities in the area.	
920	While it is necessary to have powerlines to transmit electricity from any source, including renewable energy, I must express my concern over any route that follows the CAP canal or that bisects or skirst the Tucson Mitigation Corridor. There is already too much going on in the Avra Valley that negatively impacts the ability of wildlife to cross from the Tucson Mtns to the mountain ranges further west, specifically the CAP canal and CAP recharge ponds. Besides the sensitivty regarding wildlife migration, there is the concern over the damage to the landscape (both visual as well as physical.)	
933	I am opposed to the proposed transmission routes that go through the San Pedro River Valley. This area is the last undammed river in Arizona and an important migratory corridor for birds native to the western United States. The roads that will be added along with the power lines will have severe ecological effects on the wildlife in the region. The additional development will negatively change the flow of water and disrupt the habitats of numerous endangered species.	
938	Under no circumstances should any SunZia lines pass through the San Pedro Watershed! The San Pedro Watershed shelters numbers of birds, fish, mammals, and other species virtually unparalleled in the United States. The San Pedro is one of the most important migratory bird corridors in North America while collision or electrocution by powerlines is the single greatest human-related killer of birds each year in the US. The list of threatened, endangered, and candidate species in the San Pedro Valley's [illegible] and many of them would be adversely	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	impacted by habitat fragmentation, erosion, stream sedimentation, spread of invasive species along access roads, etc.	
952	<p>We attended the scoping meeting regarding the SunZia Transmission Project held on April 29th at the Holiday Inn on Palo Verde Rd in Tucson, AZ. Saguaro Juniper Corporation has donated conservation easements on its deeded land in the San Pedro Valley to The Nature Conservancy because of the land's environmental importance. Apparently to avoid lands with conservation easements, the new proposed SunZia routes go around the deeded land in Sections 7 and 8 T13S R20E either to the north and east or to the south and west – staying on Arizona State Land (Routes C301-C331, C310-C311-C331, C275-C321-C341). This ignores the fact that the state land is as important environmentally as the adjacent private land with conservation easements. In particular, route C301 crosses directly over Willow Spring (which is not on the topo map, but is an important water for wildlife). Willow Spring is in Sierra Blanca Wash just downstream from Hackberry Spring and Sierra Blanca Spring, both of which are shown on the Soza Mesa 7.5 min Quad. Together the three springs form very important riparian habitat and make Sierra Blanca Wash an important wildlife corridor. After crossing Sierra Blanca Wash the line would go through a beautiful and unique basin which we call either the Notch Basin or Henderson Basin. This basin drains through an unusual geological feature we call the Notch into Pool Wash. C301 apparently would go either right through or adjacent to the notch. There are two other intermittent springs, not shown on the topo map (Cottonwood Spring and Muleshoe Spring) that enrich the entire area biologically.</p>	
977	<p>It would be a travesty to run the lines through the San Pedro Valley. We need to protect our environment for our water and our wildlife. When is enough for man to make money, and at who's expense...our natural desert beauty and our endangered species along this corridor. We have setup laws to protect this area...but it seems making money for this company is all that matters, and to heck with our water sheds, wildlife and maintaining our desert habitat.</p>	
1058	<p>Arizona Expanded Study Area</p> <p>The Service's concern with impacts to bats and migratory birds (e.g., raptors, waterfowl, and other large birds) is common to all potential routes listed above. Similarly, our concern with direct impacts to aquatic resources (via placement of structures and clearing of wetland and riparian-obligate vegetation and indirect impacts via sedimentation, elevated peak flows, and increased traffic) are common to all routes. The applicable narratives from our September 14, 2009 and March 11, 2010, memoranda are also incorporated herein via reference.</p>	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1168	<p>I am writing to express my grave concerns regarding one of the proposed routes for the SunZia Southwest Transmission project, specifically the route labeled E10, one of the “alternative routes subject to feasibility study” in the New Mexico Study Area Expansion of April 2010.</p> <p>As you consider alternative route E10 for your transmission line, please be aware of the following:</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>All of the residents in the vicinity of your route E10 rely on individual wells for their water – we have no other option for water services. Residents living approximately two miles north of the your proposed route E10 have, within the past year, suffered from the collapse of their wells due to drilling and blasting associated with the construction of the Burlington Northern Santa Fe railroad track in Abo Canyon, northwest of the area. Any drilling and blasting associated with the construction of a transmission line in the area must not and cannot jeopardize the aquifer or infrastructures which provide local residents their sole source of water.</p>	
1169	<p>The City has a long-standing commitment to the preservation of sensitive environmental resources including watercourses and associated riparian habitat, and habitat for vulnerable wildlife and plant species. Lands within the City, particularly those south of Interstate 10, and lands owned by the City of Tucson in Avra Valley, west of the Tucson Mountains, provide habitat for several endangered, threatened, and candidate species. Both areas are shown as potential locations for transmission lines. The City has been involved in the development of Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs) under Section 10 of the Endangered Species Act for these two areas. Those plans are available for your review and we request that they be considered in the development of the SunZia Project EIS. The City also recognizes the significant value provided by riparian habitat and has regulated impacts to watercourses for more than 20 years. Major watercourses such as the Santa Cruz, Rillito, and Pantano are especially important and the City, Pima County, the Town of Marana, and Army Corps of Engineers have invested millions of dollars in developing restoration plans for portions of these watercourses. These restoration plans, and the City's overall goal of minimizing impacts to riparian habitat, should also be taken into consideration.</p>	City of Tucson
1268	<p>If the selected route impacts water resources, mitigation for those impacts could be addressed by purchase of water rights.</p>	Empire-Fagan Coalition
1308	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buehman Canyon is a critical wildlife corridor that is jointly managed by TNC, Pima County and the USFS. Buehman Canyon was investigated and designated a "Unique Water" of the State by ADEQ in 1996.</li> <li>• Bingham Cienega is a spring-fed marsh on 285 acres that was acquired by Pima County Flood Control District in 1989 and is managed by TNC. Sonoran Cienega Wetland and Wooded Swamp are a globally imperiled natural community.</li> </ul>	Cascabel Working Group
1353	<p>We, the Aravaipa Property Owners Association (APOA), are writing you to express our strong and unanimous opposition to the Aravaipa transmission line route proposed by the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project. This route cuts through more than 20 miles of the Aravaipa Canyon watershed, crosses Aravaipa Creek on the east side of the Canyon, and bisects the Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness administered by the Bureau of Land Management to the north and Galiuro Wilderness in the Coronado National Forest to the south. Aravaipa Creek is a perennial creek in the Sonoran Desert that flows through the wilderness and the</p>	Aravaipa Property Owners Association

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>area in which the APOA members live. Aravaipa Creek is home to two federally threatened fish species, the spokedace and the loach minnow, and is the only watercourse in Arizona still to have all its' native fish species. Other species of special concern in the creek and nearby are four other fishes (longfin dace, roundtail chub, desert sucker, and Sonoran sucker), three bird species (yellow-billed cuckoo, gray hawk, and black hawk), the desert tortoise, and the desert bighorn sheep. In other words, Aravaipa Canyon and its watershed constitute a unique environment and an ecologically sensitive area. In fact, the Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness has been called the "crown jewel" of the wilderness areas administrated by BLM.</p> <p>The proposed route would cross or closely parallel Aravaipa Creek on the east side of the wilderness and cross the Aravaipa Creek watershed for much of its length, potentially destroying and altering habitat important to native species.</p>	
1396	<p>Cienega Creek and its tributaries will be impacted by the proposed SunZia project. The Pima County Board of Supervisors adopted riparian habitat maps generated as part of the SDCP [Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan]. These maps identify various classes of habitat as well as Important Riparian Areas, which are among the highest preservation priorities within the County for its linkage, habitat, water resource, flood control and recreational values. The Floodplain and Erosion Hazard Management Ordinance as amended and Conservation Lands Systems require these areas to be avoided when possible, and impacts must be minimized and mitigated.</p>	Pima County (AZ)
<b>CODE 100.00 Airspace</b>		
896	<p>A-130 and A-140 routes run right by my house and farm. The power company should bury the line. The balloon festival would present hazards for people running into the power lines.</p>	
902	<p>This northern route should allow for the testing and training that is currently taking place (and that is being planned for this area) to continue on track. The economic activity of this work is vital, not only to the state of NM, but also to the communities that serve these military bases. These missions are vital to the nation and we are constantly reminded that encroachment to the bases could have a negative impact on future missions. The northern route minimizes the encroachment impact from all the other alternatives.</p>	New Mexico Military Base Planning Commission
1080	<p>First, ranchers in this valley [San Antonio, NM] have contracts with the US Army for their use of our airspace. Our area is called the Northern Extension of White Sands Missile Range. Our agreement with the Army is to evacuate our ranch when there is a missile firing, which gives the army a clear field for their operations, such as missile reentry. The proposed lines through the Northern Extension place at risk these contracts which provide a critical service to the Department of Defense. It seems contradictory to place an electric power line through these airspaces that would be at risk of interruption by the Army's activities, when we are required by contract to leave our homes for these same activities.</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1310	<p>Following are my comments and questions on the proposed Sun Zia transmission project.</p> <p>* Impact on the Extension Area of WSMR. I am particularly concerned with the route proposed as E80, E90 &amp; E100.</p> <p>These sections pass between the launch site known as LC94 and the radar and optics sites. This site was the initial research and testing to improve the patriot missile that was used last year to destroy a de-orbiting satellite with pinpoint accuracy. What impact will the power line have on the communications needed to operate the launch site? Would it force WSMR to shut down the facility? What mitigating measures could be taken to alleviate the interference? This same area is also used for night flights by helicopters flying from Kirtland Air Force Base to WSMR for training exercises. Would the magnetic field from the line interfere with the electronics on the helicopters? Also these flights are low flying. Would the line pass a physical danger and what could be done to mitigate that danger? There is another site within two miles of the proposed line that is called ATACMS. This is an impact site for testing an anti-personnel missile. What impact would the line have on this site? There is also a no fly zone in effect over this area. Since I anticipate construction by helicopter and also maintenance, how would that be handled with WSMR as far as scheduling?</p>	
1366	<p>The compromised airspace resulting from the subject project would have a potentially devastating effect on the regional economy and quality of life. TAA is responsible for ensuring Federal Regulation 49 CFR Part 77 and FAA Terminal Instrument Procedure requirements are maintained. These regulations are intended to protect the long-term viability of safe aviation activity in the region by standardizing minimum standards for unobstructed approach and departure surfaces. Although there are numerous standards applicable to the subject project, the required 10,000-foot conical surface surrounding both airports required by Part 77 captures the majority of the design criteria and obstruction prevention goals as they relate to the subject. In the absence of more detailed information on specific structure heights, elevations of project routes, or detailed alignments of project routes; no route should be located within this 10,000-foot buffer area (as measured from the runway ends of each airport). The attached map shows this area in geographical detail. TAA opposes the location of any project route within 10,000 feet of an existing or planned TUS or RYN runway end. TAA's opposition may be reviewed, and potentially modified, if additional information is provided as discussed above.</p>	Tucson Airport Authority
1367	<p>I understand the project includes the construction of multiple 500kv poles in the vicinity of Tucson International Airport and Ryan Airfield. I'm concerned that federal aviation law (ie Part 77 surfaces) has not been considered. Please be advised that local airport zoning is less restrictive than federal law and therefore is not a viable proxy for understanding and/or addressing federal airspace standards. Moreover, airport management and airspace protection is the responsibility of Tucson Airport Authority.</p>	Tucson Airport Authority

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1401	Fort Bliss supports the inclusion and evaluation of the alternate routes in the Environmental Impact Statement being prepared by BLM. The proposed routes in Lincoln, Torrance, Valencia, and Socorro Counties could potentially minimize detrimental impacts to training and operations at Fort Bliss and other military installations in New Mexico.	Ft. Bliss
1399	A major part of the attraction for this property was the usability of the currently used airstrip that has been maintained for decades. The proposed power lines will cause air traffic exceptional risk and make the airstrip inaccessible and therefore the property essentially useless for their purposes.	Anam Inc./Willow Springs Ranch (AZ)
1405	<p>Danger to Low-flying Military Helicopters</p> <p>The line crossing my ranch [Mountainair, NM area] as well as neighboring ranches would be in military air space and would be very dangerous to low-flying military helicopters which would have difficulty seeing the lines especially in inclement weather -- especially at night. And there are many night flights. Collisions with these lines would be very possible.</p>	
<b>CODE 110.00 Noise/Interference</b>		
923	Finally, at a ranch property once on Klondyke Road/Eureka Springs property. There would be the concern for reception around 2 parallel 500 kilovolt transmission lines should we need emergency assistance or require relocation for other electronic equipment. My suggestion – follow the current power line sources without adding anything [illegible.]	
934	<p>The Cascabel Working Group (CWG) has done a great job of bringing the attention of SunZia and involved parties the myriad reasons why a San Pedro Valley route would be a terrible degradation to what is one of Arizona's precious ecological areas. Please add my voice to those who oppose any San Pedro Valley route.</p> <p>As a hospice nurse in Tucson I use this peaceful, beautiful valley with its magnificent vistas to restore my spirit in order to do the difficult work of companioning the dying. There are few places left anywhere that contain the solitude present there. Let the noise and towers follow the highways if even at greater monetary expense.</p>	
1002	<p>The E-80 route on the proposed SunZia Transmission Project crosses our New Mexico Grazing Leases GM 3065, GO 1550, and GO 1191 and comes very close to our house and the ranch headquarters on fee simple land.</p> <p>The nuisance of the noise from the humming of the lines will affect us and that, together with the general fear of health issues and safety, will be a real deterrent to prospective buyers.</p>	
1021	I greatly disapprove of your choice of location for these transmission lines through Southern Arizona going to California. I live in the community of Mescal just north of I-10 and West of Benson Arizona. One reason I chose to live here was this area has all utility lines buried	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	underground. The views of the mountains are very enjoyable. Upon study of the maps it appears a more direct route for these lines would be northern Arizona possibly following I-40 route or valley areas north of Heber and west through less populated areas. I also strongly believe such lines are very hazardous to health over time. They also interfere with A.M. radio reception.	
1268	Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time, [including] 17. Noise Pollution a. Noise from the extra high voltage conductors, particularly when wet Existing and planned in Tucson area alternatives.	Empire-Fagan Coalition
<b>CODE 120.00 EMF/Electrical Effects</b>		
1002	Re: Study Routes E-80 and E-I0 in Socorro and Torrance Counties (Mountainair, NM) HEALTH ISSUES: Whether these lines and the electromagnetic fields around them are harmful to health is not yet known. Some research has shown that there may be an increase in leukemia in children and some research has shown that they may increase the number of miscarriages in women. Apparently no research has been done on the number of miscarriages that may be caused in livestock. With casual contact, they may not be harmful, but it is not known what effect they may have on the fertility of cattle that may graze daily under and around the lines and may visit often or linger around springs, windmills and watering facilities. Not many years ago it was thought asbestos exposure was inconsequential, and we had no idea of the devastation that would come from exposure to uranium and radioactivity. The research being done on electromagnetic fields is being paid for by the large corporations that want to build these transmission lines and sell the power and the rights to use the rights of way and the lines. They have every interest in finding that they are totally safe. They may be safe (The World Health Organization has launched a large multi-disciplinary research effort.) but just the concern and worry of the public about the safety and the ruination of the beautiful views there will deter buyers and will cause the ranch to be devalued.	
1007	We are ranchers that live on the path of the proposed E90 route, running south off routes E80 and E100. Environmental degradation comes from noise, electromagnetic radiation, erosion, wild fires, increased traffic (air and surface), collisions by migratory birds and fragmentation of habitat.	
1146	One of the possible routes you have proposed for the SunZia 500 KV power lines passes through San Acacia, Polvadera, and/or Lemitar in Socorro County. I strongly object to your using this corridor and ask that you use one of your alternate corridors instead. My objection is based on (1) scientific evidence indicating possible links between EMFs and childhood leukemia, fibromyalgia, Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's, migraine headaches, sleep disorders, allergies, and asthma.	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1148	As a resident of Polvadera, I am concerned about various negative effects of these power lines and associated towers. One major concern is with effects on health. There is evidence which suggests that the EMFs associated with these lines may cause or contribute to a number of health problems, including cancer (particularly among children), migraine headaches, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, fibromyalgia, high blood pressure, asthma, chronic fatigue, insomnia and allergies.	
1227	<p>Our property lies in the southwest corner of Torrance County. Is there any radiation involved with this high powered electricity load?</p> <p>We also understand that these lines are so powerful that low flying aircraft will lose instrument power if they fly to close, and we've heard that if someone holds a light bulb underneath the tower, the bulb will light. If these towers are so powerful, what's to say they won't ignite those gas lines? These lines are a quarter mile apart and run parallel to each other the length of our property. They are a continuous worry without the threat of electricity being involved. These gas lines are 30 inches in diameter, so there is a tremendous amount of pressure running through them at any given time. Transwestern has only one pipeline, but El Paso has two 30 inch pipelines approximately 10 feet apart. What affect would the power lines have on the people that have to come out and occasional repair those lines? When they have worked on them before, they have torches, grinders, welders etc. Basically lots of fire igniters. Couldn't the static electricity, or the electricity from the towers itself (around these gas lines) potentially cause fires?</p>	
1239	What is the effect of an electric magnetic field of a 2-line, 500kv each transmission system on the health of humans, animals, and plant life in its vicinity? In close proximity, can EMF's cause cancer? Are reproductive cycles of cattle grazing nearby, for instance, negatively impacted?	
1343	Transmission lines crossing the Rio Grande will undoubtedly have significant impacts to migrating bird populations and other wildlife because they will physically bifurcate this passageway. Sandhill Cranes, waterfowl and other migrating birds could be deterred or snared by these lines strung across this corridor that has been in use since time immemorial. The electromagnetic field emanating from these lines may have additional impacts to wildlife. For these reasons, all the proposed crossings of the Rio Grande are problematic, especially the proposed route crossing at Highway 380 just north of Bosque del Apache.	New Mexico Wildlife Federation
1405	<p>Effect on Livestock and Wildlife</p> <p>Studies have shown that the large electromagnetic radiation emanating from high-voltage transmission lines adversely affects livestock and wildlife as it interferes with their migratory instincts. An Iowa study showed that livestock congregated under the high-voltage transmission lines thus interfering with their grazing habits. It must be remembered that livestock on our ranches are part of the food chain and the less trauma and disturbance they suffer the better. The radiation would also affect the Wildlife and Waterfowl NWR's along the Rio Grande river by interfering with their migratory instincts of these wildlife and birds.</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
<b>CODE 130.00 Economics</b>		
879	As an owner of parcel 130, Windmill Ranches, I submit the following: New Mexico development is crucial to the economy. Developers promote investments in properties such as Windmill Ranches and we in turn boost the overall economy. Please protect such projects for our individual properties and the New Mexico growth.	
881	SunZia lines should be kept out of the San Pedro Valley. New power transmission corridors should instead be placed along already established rail and highway corridors. The construction and maintenance of the proposed SunZia transmission lines would impact water and wildlife resources in SE Arizona, already under stress, and undermine property values and eco-tourism opportunities in the area.	
883	How does this project create jobs or economic opportunities for the areas affected by the route?	
884	I do not believe the new proposals address the issues of a river crossing between Bosque del Apache and Belen. Any crossing must be underground to preserve the integrity of the daily flight paths of sandhill cranes and migratory routes for other birds. Routes adjacent to Belen still mar the landscape/viewscape as they come past Socorro and San Antonio. Any new lines between San Antonio and Belen will damage our already struggling farmers and our ecotourisms bas that is inherently tied to our open spaces and beautiful scenery. The only acceptable routes remain those that run along the borders of White Sands and cross the river south of the Bosque del Apache.	
899	Socorro County is the second poorest county in NM. It's primary source of income (besides employees at Stallion) is generated by ecotourism. People come here to enjoy the vast scenic vistas. This project has the potential to destroy a major source of income as well as impact a major migratory flyway. I am opposed to the concept of destroying our vistas, impacting our wildlife to benefit AZ and CA. I see all the "could be" potential. But bottom line is NM will lose a way of life we all treasure to benefit someone's pockets. This concept is a travesty.	
909	I am a conservation land owner in the San Pedro River Valley. The cultural, environmental and eco-economic resources of the San Pedro far outweigh any value 2 500kV lines might provide the area, or state. Irreplaceable archeology would be lost.	
916	Do not go through the Avra Valley, Saguaro National Park, and Tucson Mountain Park. This is a unique possession for Arizona which cannot be destroyed. It is my understanding that not only is this area a protected migratory route, but also a high lightening impact area – a really great area for metal poles. This area brings in tourism dollars that we desperately need, this will drive those dollars away. Please reconsider and eliminate any route near these irreplaceable resources.	
952	These small examples are representative of a larger theme which is that it is very important that the state lease land in the San Pedro Valley not	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>be undervalued. There is a tendency to say such land is "only" state land and is inexpensive. Since economics is one of the factors in the route consideration I would like to emphasize my concern that the state land in the San Pedro Valley may be systematically undervalued economically and the urban and semi-urban land elsewhere systematically overvalued especially if looked upon in the long term taking into account ecosystem services and environmental connections. It is crucial that the environmental impact statement not undervalue the long-term economic importance of the state lands in the San Pedro Valley and the unique services they provide.</p>	
954	<p>My wife and I are very concerned that the transmission line will be pushed through because \$\$\$ talk. Talking of which, to destroy the beauty of the Sonoran Desert in this region is a sacrilege. Desert Museum, Tucson Studios, Saguaro National Park, Tucson Mountain Park are just a few of the things that make this area special and the choice of millions of visitors per year. Not to see power lines.</p>	
956	<p>I live in the Avra Valley and operate a vacation rental on 10 acres of beautiful desert. I have heard that there are plans to put a power line up the Avra Valley. This is a very troubling proposal and I am totally opposed to it. Not only would it be a major disruption to our views, but it would have a damaging impact on my rental property business. Guests constantly remark on the sunset views to the west, the sunrise over the Tucson Mountains and the general sense of quiet beauty on the western slopes of the Tucson Mountains. The Arizona Sonora Desert Museum is located here for a reason – the unspoiled beauty of this area.</p>	
959	<p>All of our friends in Socorro, San Antonio, and at the Bosque favor locating the mile wide transmission corridor at the southern end of the White Sands Missile Range. They say it's the least populated alternative, minimizing the effect on inhabitants (people and wildlife), as well as on tourists. So that's what we're in favor of, too.</p>	
962	<p>My wife and I have been visiting the Bosque del Apache for years. We love this place, and we're very concerned to hear about the possible erection of huge transmission lines for the NMSunZiaProject. Our concerns are two-fold: the effect of this project on the tens of thousands of birds and other wildlife that use the Bosque as their refuge; and the potential adverse impact of the project and its visual blight on tourism and, thus, the economy. We understand the need for energy transmission, but we are opposed to the placement of transmission lines through or adjacent to the Bosque.</p>	
989	<p>I am a candidate for a wind farm in Lincoln County. And I am 100 percent in favor of this SunZia wind project because I think that the United States needs to get off the foreign oil, and every little effort that we do is beneficial. I think that Lincoln County could use the jobs. I don't see anything derogatory to this project at all. I think it's a plus, plus. I think if all the environmental work is done properly, I just can't see how it's not a benefit to the whole Lincoln County – and adjoining areas, really. I don't have anything more to say than that. I just think it's a win, win.</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>voice its concern regarding the proposed routes of the SunZia Transmission line. While the proposed renewable energy project has benefits that are sustainable, construction of this type of transmission line will have a tremendous negative impact on surrounding property values, thereby reducing our mill levy contributions, and, in turn, our operating budget. This will reduce our capacity to carry out local conservation projects that benefit stakeholders in New Mexico. The tangible benefits for county and state stakeholders are not obvious with the SunZia Transmission Line and need further investigation.</p> <p>The construction of the transmission route is certain to disrupt the ecosystem, displacing and destroying the habitat of many native plants and animals, including endangered species. Routing these lines through National Wildlife Refuges (Sevillta NWR and Bosque del Apache NWR) is negligent in protecting these historic flyways and will cause harm to habitat, as well as to the economic gains that are received from recreation and tourism revenues. Our district, in cooperation with the USFWS, has dedicated numerous resources to help restore the Sevilleta to its natural pristine state.</p> <p>We suggest a route that exercises better judgment in providing reasonable routes for the SunZia Transmission Line. The proposed routes closest to the Rio Grande will have the greatest impact on the migratory bird flyway and will have the strongest negative impact to local economy.</p> <p>We feel that the preferable choice of the proposed route should run on the east side of the Rio Grande and of the White Sands Missile Range, along the alternative transmission line route that runs south until Interstate 10, avoiding densely populated areas.</p>	Water Conservation District
1017	<p>Cochise County has more privately owned land than any other county in Arizona which would consequently force the sale of private lands since the power line would cause visual scars to the landscape of scenic areas and adversely affect tourism thus making an already poor economy worse. California and New Mexico stand to profit from this privately-owned power line with absolutely no benefit to the citizens of Arizona or Cochise County.</p> <p>And last but not least, people living in the immediate area of these power lines would see their property values plummet further than they already have from this bad economy.</p>	
1044	<p>As a New Mexico resident proud of my ranching heritage, I feel that it is necessary to express my utter dismay with a proposal from SunZia Power Company for installing high voltage power lines on or near my families' property at Gran Quivira. This proposal, if put into action will destroy and permanently alter the very foundation of New Mexico's heritage, culture, and economic means of production in relation to ranching. New Mexico is known for its remoteness shrouding history and heritage, breathtaking vistas and incomparable diverse landscapes; all of which have been protected by New Mexico's unrelenting ability to preserve our heritage and lifestyles without sacrificing our values and culture. Another challenge faces the Land of Enchantment, sacrifice of our culture, heritage and resources for the inflammatory promises of</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>economic gain for the state? I ask, is a high voltage power transmission line, which soul purpose is to export our energy to our neighboring states benefitting New Mexico? The answer is no, allowing other states to use our property and resources for their own personal gain seems a little like prostitution in relation to resources. Individuals whom support such seditious plans for our beautiful state obviously are forgetting the long-term impacts of such types of so called "development." Has anyone considered the impact upon current means of production, land values, physical impacts to land as well as humans, or the destruction of New Mexico's heritage?</p>	
1045	<p>The Sunzia Transmission Line Project appears to be a necessary project and could be beneficial for many areas of Cochise County including the San Simon and the Bowie areas</p>	Cochise County Supervisor
1086	<p>As a resident and land owner in Lincoln County, New Mexico, I am writing to express my support for the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project. This project will help stimulate the local economy, bring needed jobs and tax revenue. Lincoln County has been blessed with an abundance of renewable energy resources, including wind, solar, geothermal and biomass. Full development of these resources will create personal income from land sales, land leases, construction jobs, fulltime jobs, as well as government revenue from sales taxes, property taxes, and income taxes. Full development of the area's renewal resources is currently being hampered because there is a lack of high voltage transmission access. The SunZia project would provide needed transmission access.</p>	
1090	<p>As a resident and land owner in Lincoln County, New Mexico, I am writing to express my support for the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project. This project will help New Mexico achieve the goal of developing the state's renewable resources. New Mexico has taken a number of steps to encourage the development of renewable resources such as implementation of a renewable mandate of 20% by 2020, and the creation of the Renewable Energy Transmission Authority. The state's leaders recognize the value of converting wind, solar and geothermal resources into electricity and how it helps diversify the state's economy and achieve energy independence. The final steps towards fully enabling this goal will be the creation of transmission capacity to deliver the electricity to market. Without access to transmission, many of these renewable resources will remain stranded.</p>	
1146	<p>One of the possible routes you have proposed for the SunZia 500 KV power lines passes through San Acacia, Polvadera, and/or Lemitar in Socorro County. I strongly object to your using this corridor and ask that you use one of your alternate corridors instead. All things considered, the corridor(s) along White Sands would seem to be far better alternatives. My objection is based on ...associated negative effects on the birdcentered tourist industry in the City of Socorro, the Bosque del Apache and surrounding communities. It is for these reasons that I object to your possibly placing power lines in my area.</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1153	Please know that I am among numerous visitors to Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge who are distressed to learn that the fragile integrity of that wildlife would be threatened by unanswered concerns regarding the Rio Grande Valley power transmission corridor. Daily flight plans will be compromised, the landscape will be scarred for miles and the tourist industry, therefore, at risk. Please work with the Friends of the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge to find solutions to these concerns that will benefit not only the wildlife but the quality of life for the local community and visitors.	
1169	The City of Tucson (City) is engaged in a long-term economic development and revitalization process for the Tucson Downtown. This effort is often referred to as Rio Nuevo. Siting of transmission lines could have a detrimental impact on this effort if they reduced the look and feel of the Downtown area. Rejuvenation of the Downtown is extremely important to the economic vitality of the entire region. Factors such as aesthetics play a critical role in the success of such efforts.	City of Tucson
1200	<p>I oppose a new corridor being opened that could cross:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• already threatened Arizona Prime Tourism areas. Phoenix has already seen a fifteen year decline in tourism revenues because Phoenix has lost the special draw of Arizona Uniqueness. The San Pedro/Aravaipa riparian areas and adjacent canyons are a unique Arizona magnet for Tourism. It has managed off-roading, fishing, hiking, mountain bicycling, river rafting, hunting due to high-impact scenery that monthly graces our publication, the Arizona Highways magazine.</li> <li>• threaten precious remaining prime riparian areas where: Central Arizona has very little pristine wildlife, ranching and watercourse areas left. These dwindling riparian areas form the backbone of wildlife corridors. Preserving crucial wildlife is ensured by maintaining real corridors. Corridors must be in various levels of non-undisturbed states depending on the wildlife affected. Arizona is a preferred destination for tourists, eco-tourists, birders and hunters from all over the world.</li> </ul>	
1223	<p>A resolution of the Board of Directors for Friends of Saguaro National Park in opposition to construction of a SunZia power corridor route through the Avra Valley.</p> <p>WHEREAS, Saguaro National Park was established in 1933 to protect the giant saguaro cactus, and preserve superb examples of the Sonoran Desert ecosystem, while affording unique recreational opportunities for visitors ... and today, Saguaro National Park is the number one tourist destination in Southern Arizona, providing an economic impact of approximately \$75 million per year to the Tucson community; and ...</p> <p>WHEREAS, this route would negatively impact thousands of acres of protected public lands, including Saguaro National Park, Ironwood Forest National Monument, Tucson Mountain Park, and the Central Arizona Project Canal mitigation corridor; and</p> <p>WHEREAS, this route would cut through sensitive habitat recommended for protection by Pima County's landmark Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan;</p>	Board of Directors for Friends of Saguaro National Park

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors for Friends of Saguaro National Park expresses its opposition to the proposed SunZia power corridor route through the Avra Valley – while acknowledging the desirability of developing and transmitting renewable energy and calls upon SunZia Transmission LLC to select an alternative route with fewer environmental impacts.	
1227	Our property lies in the southwest corner of Torrance County. We currently have Elk, deer, antelope and other wildlife on our property that NM Game and Fish gives us hunting permits to sell. This is part of our annual income that we count on. What will these towers do to the game?  We are on the boundary of the Northern Extension Area of the White Sands Missile Range. We get paid annually for the "fly space" above our land. We have been told that if these towers go up, the aircraft will not be able to fly over anymore so that part of our income will also be stopped also.	
1267	Red Doc Farm is currently renting 27 sections from Joan Donaldson, Donaldson Ranch. We are strongly opposed to one of the proposed routes for NM Sun Zia Project for the new electrical transmission lines from Corona, New Mexico through this pristine property for the following reasons:  1. The economic effect on this Ranch and the historic Ranches that surround this Ranch. These Ranches depend on contracts with the White Sands Missile Range to provide air space for military aircrafts and missile experiments. This threatens these contracts.	
1298	Any plan that calls for the use along transportation corridors (utilities/railroad and/or transportation right-of-way) between Benson and Tucson will cut through developed residential communities, displacing many local residents. This would have a negative financial impact on this area; and, the potential for delaying the entire project in court for many years.	
1306	[P]hotography is important to the area. photographers from all over the country and the world bring their \$10,000 cameras to the Bosque every year. power lines would discourage the tourists. NM has the last unspoiled views in the US. help preserve the view at the Bosque Del Apache.	
1310	I am particularly concerned with the route proposed as E80, E90 & E100.  Financial Impact From the aspect of national defense, what would be the cost to WSMR if the LC94 site had to be closed? If it rendered the Kirtland missions inoperable, what would be the cost to find another suitable site?  The ranchers in the extension area of WSMR also have contracts with the range both for the sites and possible impacts from stray missiles from the main missile range. If the power line causes WSMR to cancel or alter those contracts, what compensation would we expect? This size line also has to reduce the value of the ranch as a unit and the private land would be greatly affected. What studies have been done to try and	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	quantify that loss of value? Is there a differentiation between sub dividable land and rangeland?	
1317	I attended the scoping meeting and became convinced that the SunZia SW project is a very bad idea to go through the Avra Valley/Picture Rocks area. Arizona must protect its unique environment. It is why so many tourist dollars come to this area, once it is gone, so are those dollars.	
1329	[As a member] of the Friends of the Bosque del Apache National Wildlife Refuge I would like to convey our opposition to the proposed study area expansion, as it does not provide any new routes that would relieve our concerns regarding the wildlife and economy of our community. Routes with valley crossings between Socorro and Belen would still pose a hazard to the daily flight patterns of sandhill cranes and snow geese, as well as the migratory pathway for hundreds of thousands of other birds. The infrastructure for this transmission corridor will mar the landscape and be visible for many miles in the open vistas of the Middle Rio Grande Valley. Though population densities are low between Socorro and Belen, tourism and land values are tied to the unique views of the rolling hills of Sevilleta National Wildlife Refuge, the majesty of “M” Mountain, and the cottonwood gallery along the Rio Grande.	
1336	<p>I am writing to comment about the proposed construction of two 500-kilovolt power lines along the San Pedro River Valley. The San Pedro River corridor is internationally recognized as an Important Bird Area. As an active birder who has been birding along the San Pedro River for over 30 years, I am strongly opposed to the construction of a power line in the lower San Pedro watershed. Construction of power lines should be restricted to already developed corridors such as I-10 and other existing utility transmission sites.</p> <p>Preservation of undisturbed habitat along the San Pedro is crucial for the 350 species of birds and 87 species of mammals who use this area for migration and breeding. In addition to providing habitat for birds and animals, the thousands of birders who visit the San Pedro annually helps the economy of Southern Arizona. Riparian corridors are fast disappearing throughout Arizona and the rest of the United States. The San Pedro Watershed is such a treasure that its protection should be the highest priority for the BLM.</p>	
1393	<p>The sun is our greatest resource, and Arizona’s unique assets and talented residents can readily be engaged to create valuable technologies that utilize it. The SunZia transmission project would jeopardize these economic prospects by marring our renowned landscape and subsidizing non-Arizona interests (SunZia is tailored to the solar and wind energy ambitions of New Mexico.)</p> <p>Furthermore, with Arizona’s abundant solar energy, it would be foolish to subscribe to New Mexico’s wind endeavors. The best wind farms produce about 5 kilowatts per acre, or 0.03 kilowatt-hours per square meter per day [15]. As a SunZia map shows, the sun offers 250 times more power to Arizona land at 7.5 kWh/m2/day [16]. The future belongs</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

<b>ID</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>AFFILIATION</b>
	to innovations that give us full use of sunlight’s tremendous potential. Ill-conceived ventures like SunZia should remain in the past. Instead of serving that harmful project, Arizona should focus on originating the technology needed to tap the wealth of solar resources with which it is blessed.	
1396	Issues of concern regarding Routes F20, F30, F40 and F60 as identified on the SunZia May 2010 Arizona Land Use Resources Map. Cienega Valley Transmission Line Corridor This area is adjacent or visible from Old Sonoita Highway, Marsh Station Road and Colossal Cave Road, all of which are designated Major Scenic Routes. In addition, Highway 83, a major tourist transportation area, would be impacted by these corridors.	Pima County (AZ)
<b>CODE 140.00 Social Issues</b>		
1017	It is a well know fact that illegal aliens use high tower power lines as landmarks while traveling thus increasing the traffic of illegal aliens and raising crime levels near these power lines.	
1402	Safety: A possibly overlooked complication of the transmission line crossing our property would be the potential exposure of our lands and family to terrorist activity. High level infrastructure such as the SunZia project would no doubt be a very lucrative target for potential destruction from both foreign and domestic terrorists. The close proximity of the southern line to the residence in particular would almost necessitate the removal of all potential witnesses (ie the family who live in the residence) by the attackers in the unlikely event of an attack on the power line. There is no way of guaranteeing our safety due to the remoteness of the family residence far out in the desert. I only mention this issue because of the ranch's close proximity to a potential entry point into the continental United States from bordering Mexico the border of which has been proven to be quite porous in the past.	Anam Inc./Willow Springs Ranch (AZ)
<b>CODE 150.00 Environmental Justice</b>		
927	RE: alternative routes proposed for the SunZia SWTP in southern Arizona should follow routes that have been already compromised by infrastructure. It is inconceivable that a route is being considered that invades two well-visited Nation Parks, ie., as in F100, F104, F350, F410, F400. Additionally, the nationally recognized Desert Museum is the (after the Grand Canyon) second most visited spot in Arizona. Its viewshed will be destroyed as will be the view from Gates Pass. It is also clear that the SW area heavily populated with poor and elderly populations will be highly impacted.	
931	Re: segments F100, F104, F350, F410, F400, F360, F330, F340, F420, F430, F450, F440 F432  I object to the siting of any proposed transmission lines relating to the Sunzia Southwest Project through the 13 above-listed areas. I live in the area that would be impacted. It is the most ecologically unique and rare	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	<p>saguaro forest in the world. There is no sane or rational reason that I can imagine that would warrant siting such a project in this sensitive area. Existing infrastructure on the east side the Tucson Mountains makes much more sense as a location for the lines (along the I-10 corridor.) Low income and elderly and Native populations would be disproportionately impacted if the project was sited along the above-listed segments.</p>	
<b>CODE 160.00 Other NEPA Issues</b>		
908	<p>Specific Comments on Segment C276                      Proposed segment C276 would deface the central scenic focus of the Cascabel community – the set of cliffs along the west side of the San Pedro River. The cliffs have the following significance:                      1. Unique spectacular scenery – unique in the San Pedro Valley riddled with attractive slot canyons.                      2. Geology – the cliffs exist because of the interaction of ancient hot spring systems with basin-fill sediments. The sediments have been re-cemented and hardened by the hot water.</p>	Geology/Soils
909	<p>I am a conservation land owner in the San Pedro River Valley. The cultural, environmental and eco-economic resources of the San Pedro far outweigh any value 2 500kV lines might provide the area, or state. Irreplaceable archeology would be lost. A wilderness area from Sulfer [sic] Springs Valley to Tucson, Benson to San Manuel, would be fractured by roads and thus numerous washes/watersheds subject to erosion and extended ORV use.</p>	Geology/Soils
922	<p>The northern route through the Aravaipa would be a huge mistake. The area is pristine supporting natural plant and wildlife. 500 high voltage lines through this area would open roads in areas that when it rains would destroy with erosion all the area around the disturbed ground. There are ranches in that area that have kept the area intact, and all the wildlife and plant life undisturbed. Opening access roads encourage ATV's etc. My suggestion is to follow lines already in place. Why reinvent the wheel. I have a home out there because it is pristine! Keep it that way.</p>	Geology/Soils; Traffic
923	<p>My concern would be for the habitat of all animal life as well of the utilization of roads for ATV travel and further deteriorating of the fragile environment. Once scarred this land soil will [illegible] erode and cause washing and major erosion.</p>	Geology/Soils; Traffic
982	<p>...many things I'm concerned about. I understand that these carcinogenic – I don't know what you could call it – the sound, unhealthy, the health issues. I understand that living under these wires or near them, it can cause – the signals or whatever can cause cancer or other health problems.</p>	Health
991	<p>I'm also concerned about the effects on the health of people who live under/near these powerlines. Surely the proposal to follow the White Sands' western fence line makes more sense related to the impact on people and animals.</p>	Health

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1002	<p>We will lose part of our grazing land. During construction there will be considerable loss of grass due to the traffic and construction equipment. We may be unable to use the pastures where the construction is occurring.</p> <p>The study area is one mile wide with a view to future development. In other words, the intention is to add more and more lines to this corridor. All of the issues mentioned above will be exponentially magnified as "future development" occurs. This factor will be a major deterrent to a future buyer of the ranch. It devalues our ranch.</p> <p><b>HEALTH ISSUES:</b> Whether these lines and the electromagnetic fields around them are harmful to health is not yet known. Some research has shown that there may be an increase in leukemia in children and some research has shown that they may increase the number of miscarriages in women. Apparently no research has been done on the number of miscarriages that may be caused in livestock. With casual contact, they may not be harmful, but it is not known what effect they may have on the fertility of cattle that may graze daily under and around the lines and may visit often or linger around springs, windmills and watering facilities. Not many years ago it was thought asbestos exposure was inconsequential, and we had no idea of the devastation that would come from exposure to uranium and radioactivity. The research being done on electromagnetic fields is being paid for by the large corporations that want to build these transmission lines and sell the power and the rights to use the rights of way and the lines. They have every interest in finding that they are totally safe. They may be safe (The World Health Organization has launched a large multi-disciplinary research effort) but just the concern and worry of the public about the safety and the ruination of the beautiful views there will deter buyers and will cause the ranch to be devalued.</p>	<p>Traffic; Indirect Impacts; Health</p>
1007	<p>Environmental degradation comes from noise, electromagnetic radiation, erosion, wild fires, increased traffic (air and surface), collisions by migratory birds and fragmentation of habitat.</p>	<p>Geology/Soils; Wildfires; Traffic</p>
1038	<p>Arizona Game and Fish Department Comments on Proposed and Alternative Routes for SunZia General Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some of the proposed routes may be acceptable if adequate mitigation is provided. Examples of mitigation might include tower construction via helicopter to avoid the construction on new roads, or compensation to acquire or protect wildlife habitat or hunting opportunities in another location.</li> <li>• The EIS should evaluate the transmission line's lure to attract new development and energy projects near the line as a cumulative impact. We believe the presence of the transmission line will attract additional development, such as renewable energy projects.</li> </ul> <p>A section of C 170, where it crosses the northern end of the Galiuro Mountains, would negatively impact a considerable amount of roadless areas and is of particular concern to the Department. A route through this area would require substantive coordination with the Department on siting, construction by helicopter only, and mitigation to compensate for current and future damages to wildlife and habitat.</p>	<p>Mitigation; Indirect/ Cumulative Impacts</p>

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1042	Furthermore, it would be eco-smart to color the lines in some fashion that birds may see, even at night. As for the disruption to the ground regarding pole installation, non-contaminating products and minimal soil disruption should be observed.	Mitigation; Geology/Soils
1068	<p>Excerpt from: Redington Natural Resource Conservation District Long Range Plan, 1989</p> <p><b>MAJOR DISTRICT CONCERNS AND OBJECTIVES:</b></p> <p>1. Soil Erosion and Sedimentation – Sediment pollution of streams and erosion of rangeland is a major problem in the District. Two objectives to correct the problem are to effect physical changes in the watershed to reduce erosion and to improve range management techniques to prevent erosion.</p>	Geology/Soils
1181	<p>BLM Should Include a Robust Cumulative Impacts Analysis in the DEIS.</p> <p>In order to properly site transmission projects, it is essential that a cumulative impacts analysis be conducted to fully evaluate the implications of this type of development on public lands. We [The Wilderness Society et. al.] are aware of several other projects planned in the SunZia project area, including several new transmission lines planned by Tucson Electric Power. It is highly likely that there are other projects planned along the 460 mile route of which we are not aware. These projects will contribute to overall cumulative impacts to sensitive resources in this area, and while some of them are not being permitted by BLM, all reasonable efforts must be made to obtain information regarding their potential impacts and construction timing so that a full picture of cumulative impacts can be presented in the DEIS. A comprehensive cumulative impacts analysis including the evaluation of such projects will strengthen the DEIS, including defining appropriate associated mitigation measures, and will contribute to more informed decision-making.</p> <p>BLM Should Analyze and Require Implementation of a Full Range of Off-site Mitigation Strategies, as well as On-Site Mitigation.</p> <p>Though SunZia has the possibility of providing significant benefits by facilitating renewable energy development and thus reducing greenhouse gas emissions from electricity production, there will be significant environmental impacts from developing the project. These impacts should be avoided to the greatest extent possible by siting in areas with low resource values and minimized and mitigated to the best degree possible, using best management practices, the best available technology (also discussed in section V above), and innovative strategies for both on and off-site mitigation. For this EIS, we request development of a mitigation component that provides for no net loss in habitat for wildlife species. We also request that this component be included in the preferred alternative in the DEIS.</p>	Indirect/ Cumulative Impacts; Mitigation
1264	I oppose erecting power transmission lines through sensitive wilderness areas such as Aravaipa and the San Pedro River valley.	Traffic; Indirect/

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	The project will encourage development of roads, off-road vehicle intrusions, and completely unnecessary "development" into these areas, which can only result in the disruption of active wildlife corridors and highly complex and sensitive ecosystems.	Cumulative Impacts
1268	Recommendation of robust cumulative impacts analysis for the many additional projects planned for the area, including but not limited to additional transmission lines;	Indirect/ Cumulative Impacts
1316	This project would open the gates to human development by setting a major precedent for disturbing the wild and open country of the Galiuros. It would open pristine areas to motorized "off-highway" traffic, and eventually degrade the ecosystem to the point that highways, freeways, and associated development will no longer seem like such an impact. We've seen this trend time after time in history, enough to recognize that underregulated growth, like cancer, will continually expand its network of supply lines to feed major growth centers, eventually destroying the host.	Traffic; Indirect/ Cumulative Impacts
1385	The most scenic reaches along the San Pedro River are to be found where two sets of cliffs line the west bank of the river at Cascabel. The southern cliffs are located near the Heaven Sent Ranch, opposite Kelsey Wash. The northern cliffs begin near the confluence of Teran Wash with the river, and extend about 3 miles downstream. Two types of landform are present in the both areas: sheer cliffs and a combination of cliffs and badlands, the latter occurring to the north of the sheer cliffs in both cases. In the northern area, the sheer cliffs are in beds of brown sediment, and rounded cliffs with associated badlands have formed in overlying beds of gray sediment. In addition to their scenic value, the Cascabel Cliffs are of interest for their geological, biological and cultural significance. Furthermore, the active alluvial fans and the mesquite bosque at the foot of the northern cliffs provide a large area of relatively undisturbed habitat for a considerable variety of plants and animals.	Geology/ Soils
<b>CODE 165.00 Extend Scoping Comment Period</b>		
1051	<p>This letter is a follow up to an email I sent to you today. That email was a request on behalf of Socorro County and the Board of County Commissioner to extend the comment period beyond the June 10,2010 deadline. We have heard from several of our constituents and feel that the 45-day period is not sufficient to address the additional proposed routes through our County.</p> <p>The Board of County Commissioners will send formal comment electronically following our regular meeting on June 8th. However, we respectfully request an extension of the comment period in order to best address the concerns from our community members.</p>	
1235	The office of Congressman Teague has received calls from ranchers located in the northeastern part of Socorro County requesting an extension of the June 10th cut off for comments.	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1266	The local owners and land lease holders of the Rayo Community respectfully ask for a 45 day extension of time to assess the amended proposal for the SunZia transmission project. Although under NEPA only a federal register notice is required and notice in a local newspaper, no direct notice was provided to the property owners that are directly impacted. No one in the rural areas wake up each day and check the federal register and none subscribe to the local newspaper. It was by chance that someone discovered the notice of hearing to be held at Socorro on the 27th of April.	
<b>CODE 170.00 Not NEPA Issues</b>		
883	How does this project create jobs or economic opportunities for the areas affected by the route?	
891	Very helpful [scoping meeting.] Agent was very knowledgeable. Cleared up many questions I had before. I hope this project will complete asap.	
894	All choices involve environmental costs – the trick is to find the least environmentally detrimental option and choose it.	
911	Representatives helpful in explaining maps – however it would have been helpful if maps would have been obtained at presentation. Will be very interested in your study results of proposed and evaluated new blue lines in Cochise and eastern Pima counties. Thank you.	
913	No comment at this time. Great presentation on the project.	
929	I didn't like the format of this scoping meeting. There should have been a platform for questions and answers. The information presented was well [illegible] and could be helped by specific questions.	
1004	<p>Areas impacted and issues of concern that need to be addressed and answered. What are the short and long term effects on these items?</p> <p>Stress factor</p> <p>Mental health</p> <p>Will there be a guarantee for restitution associated with future environmental and health issues Will there be a guarantee to bare all legal expenses incurred to enforce restitution and liability Will there be a clause to rectify any unforeseen future conflicts environmentally or health related</p>	
1403	<p>To date has the government required SunZia to have money in escrow for any liability claims if project goes into effect?</p> <p>Will the initial operating funds be entirely government funds? If not what percentage will SunZia contribute?</p>	
1405	<p>Liability</p> <p>At the presenttime, the State of New Mexico has no guidelines or standards for the construction of high-voltage transmission lines, nor for liability resulting from damage to property and harm to humans and livestock. The Cluestion arises should damage or harm occur, who pays? Who compensates the people or owners of livestock ?--the State of New</p>	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	Mexico?, the Federal Government?, or SunZia? Further, if SunZia declares bankruptcy or ceases to exist, what happens to these transmission lines? If the lines are abandoned and someone is injured, what happens? Who is responsible? Who compensates? All these questions must be answered prior to construction of the lines.	
1437	How can a company get pre-qualified to bid the work? Phillips and Jordan, Inc. would like to be able to take a look at the clearing, erosion control, and access road grading for the SunZia transmission line project. How can we be put on a bidders list?	
1465	<p>the Willow Springs Ranch Phase I Owners Association, Inc. (NM), voted at its annual property owner’s association meeting to oppose this project.</p> <p>The association represents over 100 land owners with several homes located within the Willow Springs Ranch development that would be directly affected by any proposed power lines thru our residential suburban ranch development.</p> <p>The association has reviewed and studied the Sun Zia Project and opposes any and all of the proposed routes thru the Willow Springs Ranch, a map is attached below for your reference.</p>	
<b>CODE 200.00 Data Requests</b>		
930	For the benefit of those who couldn’t attend the public meeting, I would like to have the resource maps put on the website, including the following: aerial photo, land ownership & jurisdiction, environmental sensitivity and opportunity summary (sensitivity levels), cultural & paleontological resources, cultural & paleontological opportunities and constraints, biological resources, biological opportunities and constraints, land use, land use opportunities and constraints, visual and recreation resources, visual and recreation opportunities and constraints, slope.	
940	As a member of two user groups of BLM land (recreation), I am in need of two copies of maps detailing proposed routes. I need hard copy large maps. Maps on a website cannot be used for discussion and comment. I discussed this with Paul Trenter. These are needed in time to provide comments by June 10th. The following maps are needed: visual and recreation resources and opportunities and constraints, Tucson area land use constraints, land use opportunities and constraints, land ownership and jurisdiction, project study area AZ and NM.	
960	Will it be possible to obtain or purchase video, audio, or written transcripts of the Apr. 27 Socorro scoping meeting for the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project? I am currently in the D.C. area and unsure whether I will be able to attend, but am interested in the discussion.	
963	I live on Valley Loop Road in Polvadera, Socorro County. How can I find out (prior to the Apr 27 scoping meeting) whether my home and neighborhood might be affected by the SunZia SW Transmission Project, and if affected, how so? I don't want to go to that meeting	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
	without sufficient preparation, and the map presented in the 4/14 El Defensor Chieftain is not much help. Specifically, I need to know whether transmission lines (or whatever) might be placed near my home and affect property values in my area.	
964	Please provide or point us in the direction of a better map illustrating the newly proposed route through Arizona. Due to scale of posted map, it is difficult to determine proximity of considered route to sensitive areas that would be highly impacted with such construction.	
966	Following upon my request made January 22, 2010, for the minutes of all meetings the BLM has participated in related to the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project since January 12, 2010, which is the date of the last meeting for which we have received the minutes. In addition, I would like to request that I be mailed or emailed the minutes of all SunZia related meetings the BLM participates in subsequent to this request. This last step should make gathering the meeting minutes significantly easier for you and your staff as well as for the Cascabel Working Group. You could simply add us to any email and/or mailing list to which meeting minutes are already sent out. On behalf of the Cascabel Working Group, I would also like to thank you for the previous minutes you sent us. We very much appreciate your openness in sharing relevant information. Please do let me know that you received this email and whether there is anything else I can do to facilitate this request.	
969	<p>A few of us from Windmill Ranches went to the meeting held last Oct. 27, 2009 in Alamogordo, NM. Everything was still up in the air then, and nothing definitive was decided as to where the transmission lines would be erected (in relation to Windmill Ranches). I was just touching bases to see if there have been any new developments yet.</p> <p>At the meeting last October it was suggested that we (Directors and Residents of Windmill Ranches) could have a meeting with some representatives of the Sun Zia project at the Town Hall in Carrizozo to discuss any new developments or decisions that have been made in the Spring. Let me know if any thing has changed or if there have been enough developments or decisions that would affect our area. If there has, and anyone would like to discuss the developments with us, then let me know and I will reserve the Town Hall preferably on a Saturday during any month you choose. If not, let me know so that I can inform everyone in our newsletter, that no new developments have been made.</p>	
972	I am researching the proposed routes for the transmission line in where it crosses the Rio Grande Valley near San Antonio. Do you have any maps available on a smaller scale that would give me more precise detail about where the line is proposed to cross the valley? Thank you.	
976	I live on Bosquecito Road in Socorro County in the proposed path of the SunZia transmission lines. I had not heard about the project until recently. Having searched the internet for info on the project, I cannot find the current status. Please let me know or point me to a source of current info.	

**Table E-1 Comments Summary Table**

ID	COMMENT	AFFILIATION
1068	<p>At our coordination meeting of April 15, 2010 concerning the proposed Sunzia transmission line placement through the Lower San Pedro River Valley Mr. Siegel of EPG and yourself indicated that you would like to participate in a work group meeting with the Redington and Winkelman NRCs to further our discussion in more detail of available data to be incorporated into the Draft EIS. We would like to move forward with this meeting and propose to meet on June 24th at 1 p.m. in San Manuel, AZ at the Gardner Middle School Main Library (715 S Ave D). We also extend this invitation to other involved government entities and agencies so that we may all review the data and concerns for the proposed line. In order to provide adequate notice to all parties please respond to this meeting notice no later than June 11th.</p>	
1268	<p>Can I get more information on the designation of the Wind Resource area on the above referenced map which is located approximately east of Albuquerque, NM between Galisteo, NM and Carrizozo, NM? Who designated this? What are the plans for transmission lines in this area?</p>	
1341	<p>Please add me to the mailing list for the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project. I am interested in receiving all press releases, copies of all public comments, and the draft environmental impact statement. Electronic copies are preferable where available. It is my understanding that public hearings were in Socorro, NM; however, local residents have indicated that no notification was provided to East Mountain and Estancia Valley communities. According to one resident, proposed relocated line locations may impact visual resources in the vicinity of Gran Quivira, a historic site that is part of the Salinas Pueblo Missions National Monument, and Deer Canyon Preserve [Mountainair, NM]. Please provide copies of all visual resources modeling associated with the project. Please provide also provide copies of all scoping documents; comments submitted to date; minutes, records, and/or transcripts of public scoping meetings; agency consultations including, but not limited to, those conducted with the New Mexico State Historic Preservation Officer, the US Fish and Wildlife Service, and the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish; and all other documentation associated with the project.</p>	