

From: corridoreiswebmaster@anl.gov
To: [Corridoreisarchives;](#)
CC:
Subject: Energy Corridor Programmatic EIS Comment 80114
Date: Wednesday, November 30, 2005 10:21:13 PM
Attachments:

Thank you for your comment, Richard Spotts.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is 80114. Please refer to the tracking number in all correspondence relating to this comment.

Comment Date: November 30, 2005 10:21:00PM CDT

Energy Corridor Programmatic EIS Scoping Comment: 80114

First Name: Richard

Middle Initial: A

Last Name: Spotts

Address: 1125 W. Emerald Drive

City: St. George

State: UT

Zip: 84770

Country: USA

Email: spotts@infowest.com

Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record

Comment Submitted:

I appreciate this opportunity to submit scoping comments. I believe that energy related corridors should be combined whenever possible to minimize adverse impacts. I also believe that energy corridors should avoid national parks, wilderness areas, wilderness study areas, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs), Research Natural Areas, national wildlife refuges, national or state wild and scenic rivers, critical habitats, and other specially designated areas. I know that new corridors may fragment habitats and thereby harm wildlife species, especially those - like many neotropical nesting songbirds - that are interior sensitive (rely upon unbroken blocks of forest or other vegetative cover). As such, corridors should be located to avoid or at least minimize such

fragmentation. Corridors may also provide access for unauthorized recreational uses into more remote areas, such as ATV uses. Such motorized uses can cause serious resource damage and facilitate the colonization or spread of harmful noxious and/or invasive weeds. These weeds can overcome native vegetation, alter the ecology of habitats, and change fire patterns and intensity. I recommend that a standard list of mitigation measures be developed and presented in the PDEIS. This list should include requirements for: full inventories of cultural and wildlife resources in the path of proposed corridors so that final alignments can avoid significant resources as much as possible; that all vehicles and equipment used in corridor construction and maintenance be power washed when moved from one area to another to reduce the potential spread of noxious or invasive weed seeds or vegetative matter; to require adequate separation of power lines to prevent raptor electrocutions; and to eliminate ravens that may use new power lines within desert tortoise habitats to successfully prey on tortoise hatchlings. This standard list of mitigation measures should then be carried forward into the NEPA review process for all site-specific corridor proposals. All of these measures would be presumed to be appropriate and required, unless the responsible agency makes a finding in the subsequent NEPA review that one or more such measures are not necessary, and provides a supporting rationale to justify this finding. Finally, I hope that most future corridors will supply energy generated from cleaner, renewable sources like wind, solar, and geothermal. Global warming is an increasingly serious problem, and we need to accelerate the transition away from continued reliance on fossil fuels. As such, I wonder if some power lines can be fitted with solar collectors and/or wind turbines to help hasten this transition.

It would be great if future power lines could not only transport energy, but also help generate it closer to the ultimate users. Thank you very much for considering my comments.

Questions about submitting comments over the Web? Contact us at: corridoreiswebmaster@anl.gov or call the Energy Corridor Programmatic EIS Webmaster at (630)252-6182.