

Appendix C Consolidated Scoping Comments

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

EPTP Consolidated Scoping Comments

	Page
Access and Transportation	1
Agriculture	6
Alternatives	26
Cumulative	54
Electrical Characteristics	60
Environmental Justice	64
Floodplains/Wetlands	65
Generation	67
Health and Safety	69
Historic or Cultural	78
Land Use	79
Map Comments	92
Noise	103
Process	104
Public Involvement	111
Radio or Television Interference	132
Recreation	134
Residential	135
Rights-of-Way Acquisition	152
Social or Economic Values	157
Soils	170
Vegetation	173
Visual	175
Water	181
Weeds	182
Wildlife	184

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

The following set of tables includes each of the comments received between January 1 and March 16, 2007, reproduced exactly as they were received by Western with two exceptions: (1) legible spelling errors in the comment forms are reproduced here, noted by "sic," and (2) illegible comments were interpreted using best professional judgment and knowledge of the project issues and spelled correctly for ease of readability. The database itself has not been modified. Some comments are reproduced under several topics because they address more than one topic. For some comments, introductory sentences have been included to maintain the context in which the comment was made. The order of comments within a topic is random and is not meant to imply importance or level of consideration in the EIS.

Access and Transportation

- Do you need to put a roadway where there isn't one? Accessibility?
- N3 goes through bottom ground- difficult to service and floods. N2 and N4 preferred.
- County road 44- can extend this road onto north pasture to access line- T12S.R52W., Sec. 17.
- Prefer to keep route along County, Rd 71. Road becomes a trail in section 10. Good Access.
- Notify [Mike Klann & A&D Farms] of land access needs T8S R52W Sec. 8 along G4.
- Issue: location of towers in relation to roads, section lines, adjacent easements.
- 2 aerial app runways just N of D2.
- Air force academy aux. runways.
- People can get in there now with combines and pick-ups with no trouble so don't B.S. us saying it is not possible.
- No current access through farmed land along route L22.
- I do not want access to my property and destruction of rail fence on the east side.
- Prefer route L-2 avoids rough country of the breaks.
- The changes made to the L2 section of the line is a much wiser idea due to the fact it would avoid a lot of our rough country (the breaks) and it also avoids many homes.
- Why not go along a major highway where there is much easier access.
- We have several problems with their proposed plan which is to obtain a two hundred foot wide easement and to construct a thirty foot permanent access road.
- How will this project impact the proposed private toll road that may go therw [sic] this area?
- This land is terraced and has areas of steep slopes making it very difficult to spray with a ground sprayer.
- Most of our business includes the use of agriculture aircraft which use two (2) runways for taking off and landing. Both runways have an easterly direction, on southeast the other northeast.
- Also since we are the only public use airport in Cheyenne County, many other private and some commercial use airplanes come and go here using the hospital, nursing home, funeral home, county fair, emplement [sic] and other businesses.

Access and Transportation

Their ingress and egress transition is of concern as well.

- Privately owned public use airport SE4 14-14-44.
- Some times [sic] during the warm months, taking off can be quite an effort requiring some distance to attain an altitude sufficient to clear power lines of your proposed [sic] height.
- Our family own and operates a commercial crop protection business two (2) miles east of Cheyenne Wells, Colorado on Highway 40 which includes our airport.
- existing undeveloped road easement.
- There is a residence in the NW 10-21-36 that serves a farm headquarters for Kuhlman Family Farms, LLC. This headquarters is complete with a 2,650 foot grass runway that is used for my personal aircraft. Construction of this transmission line across the South end of that runway would effectively eliminate my main access to my farm operation. Your use of the alternate route of B2, B3, B4, B9, B11, B14, B18, B20, B21 would remove this conflict.
- Redraw of alternative route G3 to avoid runway running N-S T7S R54W sec 19 & 20. Map 7.
- An area of steep hills and wet ground were identified as well as farmland near proposed J4 route Sec. 21 T11S R56W. Map 9.
- Airport runway in Section 11 T15S R62W. Map 11.
- "—Many homes identified to be an issue beneath alternative J5 route in subdivided Sections 23, 26, and 25 of T13S R61W.—Airport location identified along alternative route J5 Section 18 T13S R60W." Map 11.
- Airport location identified south of re-draw alternative route in Section 17 T14S R60W. Map 11.
- "—Railroad routes drawn in north half of T19S R62W and south half of T18S R62W.—12 proposed close to line/railroad in Sec. 27 and 28 T19S R63W." Map 14.
- Identification of potential access point Sec. 17 T12S R52W for proposed F7 route. Map 19.
- Hanger/air strip identified north of proposed D2 route in Sec. 23 T21 R45W. Map 26.
- T21S R38W, Sec. 31-36, is this a road? Check. Map 46.
- A7 36-21-37 Kearny Co. KS. This line is proposed to run on the 1/2 mile line. That means it will not parallel a county road or access road.
- In addition, locating the transmission lines on active farmland will adversely impact the ability to conduct agricultural aviation activities necessary on that property as it will create a greater danger in the conduct of those activities and will result in an increased cost to the farmers contracting for agricultural aviation work (assuming that the individuals involved in that industry will provide those services to areas crossed by or under transmission lines).

Access and Transportation

- What about flight for life vehicles leaving our hospital en route to major hospitals in the metro area?
- The effect on air plane traffic/spray planes.
- The southern alternative for the Big Sandy- Burlington line in T10S, R52W would be better along the correction line about three miles south of the current alternative. A route there would have better access and be adjacent to an existing line.
- Boyd—has runway/landing strip T7SR54W, Section 19 (drawn on map).
- Currently there is no county road along the section line, but if so, he would need an extra 40 ft to account for any future road. "If we could do this for him, it would make all the difference...and he knows other farmers must feel the same way.
- There currently are no roads along the north edge of Section 32, but he is assuming we will off-set the 200 ft easement to allow for future County Roads should they be built.
- When I think of the damage that will be done by taking heavy equipment through, even one time, I know we will be dealing with the damage forever. The routes left by the wagon wheels on the Santa Fe Trail, are still visible to this day- and that wasn't done by heavy equipment!!
- First of all, I don't understand why this route would not follow an existing road or trail as much as possible, considering the use of heavy equipment (cement trucks, etc.), for construction, and for future maintenance. It would be much less damaging for the whole area, now and long term.
- Many times there are other wildlife on this grass. Once you establish a road or trail we can count on unwanted traffic through these areas. Not good for the grass, livestock, or the wildlife.
- My main concern for the proposed route <J4> is the crossing of section 21, T11S, R56W, is that this property is mostly wetland and is sometimes almost impassable with a pickup. Long Creek runs thru the middle of this section.
- Also trying to get equip. and material in an out would be very difficult.
- Any traffic (foot or vehicle) is impossible in these sand dunes.
- Will this line have a negative effect on small aircraft instruments; ability to fly into the area.
- What effect, if any on flight for life vehicles leaving our hospital en route to major hospitals in the metro areas.
- If proposed route K9 is chosen then we would request a change in its route. Specifically we would suggest that it make its turn at T4S/ R55W/ S35 (three miles to the north of where proposed). This would allow both lines to cross the public road at the same place, reducing its visual impact, and in addition would avoid some of the rougher terrain encountered in Township 5S. There would also not be homes, farmsteads or driveways along a more northern route.

Access and Transportation

- As I also indicated to Jim I do not want to have to assert a claim for damages. I live 280 miles east of the property, and typically only visit the location about two times a year. So I may not find issue, if I granted the project access for some time. Currently I have no problems managing the property, because I grant no one, not even my neighbors, access for hunting, etc. It makes life a lot easier, and precludes any potential liability.
- I understand, as stated in the agreement, that you will be responsible for any damages to the property that may result from your core drillings, survey crews, environmental impacts assessments, etc. My concern is that if I grant access to the property that those individuals will be instructed to use reasonable judgment when performing their tasks. Not enter a field with a heavy truck when the fields are wet nor cross an intermittent stream or draw with the same. This action will typically create an erosion problem.
- The proposed power lines contemplated by the Transmission Project will further fragment existing rangelands and wildlife habitat with access roads and construction impacts.
- Section 27 is the location of the proposed EPTP alternate power line route and switching station site (identified as M4). For the following reasons, you should choose M3 as the preferred route: 1. The alternate route (M4) runs right through the middle of active producing farm land that supports the livelihood of four families. The alternate proposed M4 switching station(as I was informed by your engineers) would consume 5-10 acres of land in the center of this producing farms, taking it out of production permanently. This does not take into account access roads required to maintain the facility. This reduction in producing farm land would cause unreasonable hardship.
- I have also heard that the power lines cannot be installed on the Bohart Ranch because it is State or protected property, however there is already a aircraft landing strip and other 75 foot transmission lines going through that property.
- Our concerns are specific to the proposed substation mile 125. We are concerned about extra use of this county Rd. traffic/ maintenance.
- What kind of easement action will be required/ proposed? There are concerns of field damage based on easement access locations.
- The Metro District land applies biosolids to certain fields within the METROGRO Farm at any given time. It is not necessarily the typical seasonal type farming operation throughout the year. There could also be any number of special projects taking place on the Farm at any given time, such as road projects, conservation projects, on-going research projects, chemical spraying, etc.
- safety concerns at the Limon Airport: On the energy center to Big Sandy route proposed routes F8 and F9 and F11 would tend to encroach into flights from the south. Therefore, route F-10 which approaches the Big Sandy substation from the east would be the preferred route.

Access and Transportation

- safety concerns at the Limon Airport: Limon's airport landing strip runs north and south. The prevailing winds are from the North. This means planes must approach the airport from the south. Proposed routes J2 & J3 (Midway to Big Sandy) would cross the flight path for an approach from the south. Therefore route J1 would be the preferred route for the Midway to Big Sandy power line.
- The two main concerns with the routes are safety concerns at the Limon airport and concern about the visibility of the power lines.
- land locked area- how will you get to lines to check or fix them?
- The proposed placement of the "Lamar North" line on road SS on the South side of the present power line will allow the continual limited use of our spray strips (T/O & edge) as marked on your meeting maps it will maintain Road SS as our emergency landing strip. The "lamar south" line north of road RR seems appropriate as it will not impact our proposed landing strip one mile south of the E-W line and that road does not have as much of a blowing closed concern.
- I would also suggest the "Big Sandy" 500kV line be located on the south side of the E-W county line road as this northern area has more wind and resultant road closures due to accumulating winds and snow from the North.
- In purple of blue marker, N 1/2 of section 27: NW of section 35, SW, SWSE of Section 6 T21S, R43W, Sixth PM, Prowers county, Colorado. In addition to these parcels we have Ag/aircraft spray strips as indicated on the maps and at the 2/21/2007 Lamar Meeting.
- My land, W2 SE4 Sec. 17; SE4 Sec 18, T11S R56W 6th PM, (240 acres) is contract Farm 0436 under USDA Conservation Program. Under the terms of the contract no vehicle traffic is allowed on the property, for any issue involving surface use we would feel compelled to involve: US Dept of Agriculture, Farm Service Agency, PO Box 97, Hugo, CO 80821, 719-743-2408.
- Landing strips for our aerial application along Road SS.
- The location of this section is prime for development in the future. With the Co Hwy 79 along one side and Bromley land on the other access is prime.
- Some of the benefits to this routing-- Existing, county maintained hwy running north and south. (this is of concern because our east to west roads drift heavily with snow in the winter months. Hindering access times. Crosses large expanses of open country 'near' the already paved road.
- We've been hearing that the ASAFB drop zone is & has been moved. (You can verify that quicker than we can). I know we (neighbors) have not been seeing any activity there for quite sometime.
- Damage to crop and pasture land caused by construction traffic.
- Road K, it will be a mess to farm around it.
- How can we help you? What needs do you have when you put transmission lines thru [sic] the farm ground?

Access and Transportation

- Considering developing agro-tourism on property. Power lines would detract- visual quality.
- On the lines N of I-70 the G4 line would take up a large swath of farmland.
- On the G4 line the southern route of G5 would be the best due to far less farm ground involved. Much more grass land and less tillable fields and less people.
- [G5] less impact on irrigation and farm ground.
- G3 cuts right thru (sic) farmed area SW to NE.
- Potential impacts to water sources (livestock) 200' clearance.
- T.8S-r.52W., Sec. 10,11 S2 is farm land (dry crop) & it would be difficult to farm around structures.
- Crop is never fallow- farmed every year.
- Concerned about C4 crossing middle of fields, property along C4, most of T19S, R43W.
- We just purchased the large aced ranch- your lines are going through- please contact us whenever you need to.
- We have farm and ranch property in Colorado and Kansas. Our property in KS is located on your maps #37 & #39- Township12, S.R. 40 West- that will carry the proposed power lines.
- After viewing the locations, and speaking with your representatives about our concerns with animals grazing, farming operations, and electrical interruptions we have no concerns with this crossing our properties and support the choices you've made to cross through our properties as we continue with day to day operations- Christine & Greg Talbert.
- Our animals won't have any problems as per your reps.
- Look for ways to facilitate movement of machinery around towers for controlling weeds or for farming.

Agriculture

- How do you span the 1/2 mile center pivot irrigation systems?
- Where line is crossing or on the edge or a property or fence line, it would be better to off-set the Trline [sic] at least about 100' so farm equipment can circle around structures.
- Has plans to build 3/4 circle center pivot (drawn on map).
- As a general rule I propose that you keep the structures 60' from roads and section lines so we can get machinery between the structure and the road/section line. This will help us control weeds and maneuver around the structures.
- Have concern about pulling wells as far as safety for drilling co. Check on OSHA requirements.
- Have irrigation well on 32-23-34 and 18-23-34. Those are right on county Right-of-way.

Agriculture

- Prefer the route to cross the farm ground than the grass land. Concerned about stray voltage, icing dropping off on cattle.
- Don't want it though the grassland- prefer the farmground. Own both but concerned it would have a negative effect on cattle.
- What monetary compensation will be offered for loss of aesthetic value and possible loss of revenue generated by ag tourism?
- We have urban visitors that enjoy the same view; hunters, bird watchers, wildlife photographers, and people who like to experience working ranch activities.
- Ag tourism: Bird watchers, wildlife photographers, hunters and people who want to experience activities on a working ranch.
- [Kiowa County Commissioners & neighbors] Discussion of spray booms and tower location relative to section lines- general consensus is put towers as close as possible to lines- don't try to leave space between section line and towers to allow booms to pass- equipment is different and likely to change over time.
- Please place towers to the edge of property section lines so there is greatest limit of loss of farming ability.
- Future farming equipment will only increase in size.
- 80 acres irrigated was of major concern, however after speaking to representatives @ meeting and viewing much larger map that I could actually see sections etc.
- Alternative route close to family farming land.
- Consider relocate of B18 to go through soil bank vs. over farmland at T10S, R41W, Sec 13, NW 1/4.
- My concerns: the power line is proposed to go across our entire 1/2 section of pasture which grazes 30+ horses all of the time. The structures themselves would be a major obstacle in rounding up the horses, which occurs on a frequent basis.
- Impacts on agriculture- take away our non-irrigated corners near center-pivot
- T2S R61W Sec 14 and 23 prefer location on west side of 246 road- so don't interfere with irrigation pond.
- Land on west side not center-pivot irrigation.
- Prefer that you not split irrigation circles in L9.
- Horse rescue, grazing animals, hay growing.
- Its got rescued horses and show horses growing hay (grass).
- We raise our own chickens for eggs and breed dairy goats to provide milk for our family.
- The children have horses they have learned to care for and a safe, quiet area to ride them.

Agriculture

- We have been advised about the proposed high voltage power line project which is projected to run through our property, directly alongside our home and barn.
- In the past few years we have thrown ourselves into hobby farming on our 73 acres.
- I have received a notice of this project in the mail with a map, I would like to know if this will cross my farm, the map does not go into detail enough to see were [sic] the lines will be.
- The land I farm in this area is section 8 and 9-21-35 Kearny Co. Kansas.
- All this land has grassland on it. Your consideration to use this grassland route rather than cropland would be very much appreciated.
- I spray this cropland by airplane every year and usually several times a year to spray herbicides on this farmland to control weeds.
- To help me reduce soil erosion, I use an airplane to spray this cropland because a ground sprayer is very difficult to use on this land.
- Your map also shows line B7 taking a 45 degree angle across cropland as it turns south. This grassland route would also prevent you from having to angle "line B7" across cropland just to the east of my cropland.
- Section 14-22-35 is our farm headquarters. This land has two homes, livestock facilities, and grain storage.
- The route goes across a cropland area when there is grasslands just to the south of this same area.
- Section 8 and 9-21-35, Kearny Co. Kansas is cropland I farm and electric line B7 is proposed to go across this land. I have other land your electric line will go over, however this is land that would cause me the most difficulty and there is an alternative route that should work better for both of us.
- Our family own and operates a commercial crop protection business two (2) miles east of Cheyenne Wells, Colorado on Highway 40 which includes our airport.
- Most of our business includes the use of agriculture aircraft which use two (2) runways for taking off and landing. Both runways have an easterly direction, on southeast the other northeast.
- We are studying uses for our land over the next few years and this power line will greatly reduce the value of our land and make it almost impossible for development, farming and ranching, irrigation, conservation easement.
- Sheet map 31 2) As C5 begins, line should remain on Sec. 10 & 11 to stay away from irrigation and dryland as much as possible.
- Sheet map 31 3) As C5 heads south, it should begin 1/2 mile earlier than proposed but stay in west half of sec. 12 & 13 to stay away from irrigation on sec. 14 and house as it travels further south.

Agriculture

- Sheet map 31 4) We are strongly opposed to C6 & C4 as they cross by nice houses and our feedlot and many irrigated parcels. Please contact me if you have questions as to our comments
- We have a section and half of center pivot irrigation on 33-24-34 Terry Township; Finney County Ks. And 8-23-34 Finney County. There are well on 33-24-34, 21-21-34; 15-22-34.
- The SE corner of the SE 1/4 of section 17-9-43 is my farm headquarters with shop facility, grain storage, livestock facilities, and most importantly my home.
- Currently it is used for pasture for cattle, but we don't know if our renter will continue to graze his cattle there if there are power lines.
- If the power lines go through the property I own, will their presence devalue the property for uses other than grazing and farming?
- An additional power line is definitely in opposition to the character of Craig Ranch Bed & Breakfast, LLC & Horse Motel. Direct quotes from our website that do not agree with the proposed power line follows: " Go with us in the pick up to check cattle, water, and fence. Bring your horse and enjoy horseback riding on our 15,000 acre ranch. Bring your camera and photograph wildlife."
- we pasture horses on the grass.
- I am a no till farmer and spraying around power poles is dangerous.
- He doesn't have a tractor and plow small enough to fit between the tower legs and may need to buy a new tractor just for this purpose.
- Ernie then asked what impact the line would have on his organic farming practice in the field adjoining the preferred route.
- Ernie had called WAPA on February 21, 2007 about concerns with radio interference and effects on his organic farming practices from the proposed EPTP project. I (Bob Pearson) called Ernie on February 22nd to discuss his concerns.
- He was also concerned with loosing [sic] this organic certification due to the presence of the new line. I told him that I didn't see how this would happen.
- I farm and ranch south of Burlington and prefer the proposed route over the alternates.
- The line preferable would not go over farm ground. It is difficult to farm around poles.
- Also cattle wubbing (sic) on the poles makes for no grass to grow and makes a blow-out area.
- What kind of barriers will put around the poles so cattle don't rub against them?
- In regards to the proposed B1-B2 route the B1 route impacts our farming operation in Sec 14-24-34.
- The box canyon affect has a direct impact upon aerial spraying operation over the farm ground.

Agriculture

- Expect crop damage from construction to last for multiple crop cycles due to compaction of construction equipment and be prepared to reimburse farm operators for lost production through those cycles.
- Avoid farmland where possible and route through pasture and non-tilled areas.
- There is a residence in the NW 10-21-36 that serves as farm headquarters for Kuhlman Family Farms, LLC. This headquarters is complete with a 2,650-foot grass runway that is used for my personal aircraft. Construction of this transmission line across the south end of that runway would effectively eliminate my main access to my farm operation. Your use of the alternate route of B2, B3, B4, B9, B11, B14, B18, B20, B21 would remove this conflict.
- Expect crop damage from construction to last for multiple crop cycles due to compaction of construction equipment and be prepared to reimburse farm operators for lost production through those cycles.
- Segment M4 re-draw to east of Erie Tap T1N R64W Sec. 28, 29 then rejoins M4 route. Re-draw to avoid cropland. Map 1.
- "—Section 23, 22 of T2S R61W proposed L15 on W side of road 246 because location of center pivot irrigation and a home site.\ —L9 and L15 redraw 1/2 mile south in Section 31 T2S R60W because of location of windmill for stock tank, wildlife pond, and hunting club." Map 2.
- "T7S R56W Sec. 25, 26 — Grain bins drawn (in purple) along L1". Map 7.
- "T7S R56W Sec. 27 — L1, grain bins Sec. 29 — (L2) Lester Malcom house Sec. 28, 29 — (L2) Two more structures labeled "Malcom" Map 7.
- Re-draw of K5 proposed route slightly west to avoid dryland farming (wheat, feed) T6S R56W Sec. 22 & 23. Map 7.
- "T1S R56W NE1/4 Sec. 34 — Grain bins/shop drawn (purple)". Map 7.
- Windmill identified near alternative N3 and north side of I-70 T9S R57W Sec. 4. Map 8.
- Windmill for stock watering identified near N1 and N2 Sec. 29, T8S R57W. Map 8.
- "Identified center pivot irrigation circle near alternative route N4. T9S R58W Sec. 22, Re-draw of alternative approximately 1/2 mile N into 125-mile substation." Map 8.
- An area of steep hills and wet ground were identified as well as farmland near proposed J4 route Sec. 21 T11S R56W Map 9.
- Identification of quonset bin along F8 alt route as well as sand hills, sandy soils in Sections 3 and 4 T11S R55W. Map 9.
- "Identified locations along the proposed F7 route including Section line, dam in seven mile creek, house, corrals, and steel shed in Sections 7 & 8 T11S R53W." Map 9.
- Identification of well with solar tank and Yaklich RI/TVI/AN ground clearance, and farm in Sections 18, 19, and 20 of T12S R57W. Map 10.

Agriculture

- Corral, old coal mine, home identified; Section 32, 33 T14S R60W near proposed J4 route. Map 11.
- Re-draw of J4 proposed route starting Sec. 34 T14S R59W continues to run east approximately 2 miles; turns north (due N) in Sec. 36 T14S R59W and runs north until meeting original J4 route (proposed) in Sec. 13 T14S R59W. Reason: possible sprinkler circle in Sec. 23 T14S R59W. Map 11.
- Barn & windmill identified under J10 proposed route in Sec. 23 T15S R63W. Map 12.
- Identification of dryland ag., CRP land and pasture north of proposed G4 route, Sections 10, 11, and 12 T8S R52W and dryland farm south of G4, Sections 10, 11, and 12 T8S R52W. Map 21.
- Identification of 3 Rivers Ranch leased by Mike Klann and A&D Farms, Sections 7 and 18 T8S R51W under proposed G4 and existing 230 kV line. Map 21.
- "—Identification of Witt property, Sec. 17 T8S R51W, south of the proposed G4 route.— Identification of Witt property feed lot and homesite under alternative route G3, Sections 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21 of T7S R50W." Map 22.
- Re-draw of alternative route H3 in Sections 35 and 36 in T1S R44W. At NW corner of Sec. 36 and NE corner of 35, H3 runs west along 25 Rd and south through middle of Section 25 through township line between T1S-T2S and rejoins original H3 alternative in Sec. 2 of T2S R44W. To avoid cultivated land in Sec. 35, T1S R44W and center pivots in Sections 1 and 2 in T2S R44W. Map 28.
- Identification of Wine Glass homesite 1871-5 in Sec. 25 T3S R45W; Fox Ranch to west of proposed H2, and McCoy Ranch to east of H2. Map 29.
- Identification of vacant corrals and wind breaks in Sec. 25 T2S R45W near proposed H2. Map 29.
- Re-draw of proposed H2 to avoid center pivots and homesite in Sections 25 and 36 of T4S R45W to run 1/2 mile east of proposed down the range line between R45W and R44W to 1/2 mile into Sec. 1 T5S R45W, then runs diagonally south of proposed H2 in Sections 6, 7 and 8 in T5S R44W until it meets original proposed H2 around 4 Rd and CC Rd in Sec. 17 T5S R44W and continues south. Map 30.
- Identification of crop/grassland under alt. G5, Sec. 1 T9S R45W. Map 31.
- "—Identification of pivot in Sec. 15 T8S R43W; prefer proposed B21 to go on north side of Y.00 Rd in Sections 14 and 15 T8S R43W.—Identification of feed lot (Section 13), and irrigation well (Section 24), T8S R43W.—Re-draw of proposed B21 route to follow north and east borders of Sec. 24 T8S R43W instead of bisecting." Map 31.
- "—Identification of center pivot circles, Sections 1, 12, 13, 24, and 25, and grain bins in Sec. 25 T10S R43W.—Re-draw of proposed C5 in Sec. 25 jobs west 1/2 mile around grain bins, south through Sec. 36, and jobs east to rejoin proposed C5 in Sec. 36 T10S R43W. —Re-draw line runs to east of Range line, Sections 6, 7 and 18 T10S R42W and west of Range line, Sections 24, 25, and 36 T10S R43W." Map 32.

Agriculture

- Re-draw of proposed C5 line in Sec. 7 T15S R42W to run south down east Section line, avoiding farmed land, then jogs west of Sec. 18 and rejoins C5. Map 33.
- Re-draw of proposed F1 route in Sections 2, 3, and 10 T21S R43W. Section 2 is grazing to cultivated land. Re-draw runs south on Section line, west on Section line (Sec. 2), and south down 29.00 Rd into Sec. 23, where it cuts diagonally NW to SE into the Energy Center substation. They prefer single pole. Map 36.
- Identification of farm and soil bank in Sections 12 and 13 T10S R41W under proposed B18. Map 37.
- Identification of sold property and quonset grain bins west of B14 proposed in Sec. 29 T15S R40W. Map 41.
- Sec. 4 — New center pivot ag. Drawn Map 49.
- "T25S R35W Sec. 20, 21 — Tri-State line drawn T25S 33W Sec. 5, 8 — A1 re-draw further east by 1/2 mile T24S.
- R33W Sec. 17, 18 — Re-draw of B1 T24S R34W Sec. 24 — Proposed disposal site (B1) T23S R34W Sec. 19, 29, 30, 32 — Circled locations of oil wells, hay mill, and houses T24S R36W Sec. 32 — Re-draw and circled residences" Map 49.
- Her sister's land (Sec. 8 T23S R34W) may be affected, as a corridor runs between Sections 7 and 8 of that T&R; this Section has center pivot irrigation and is a concern for her and her sister.
- Denver Metro Wastewater requested a more detailed map they have 5 2,000 acres east of Deer Trail and lease some land to a farmer, who received a scoping packet.
- magnetic fields on existing livestock fencing, existing livestock wells powered by wind or electricity.
- Keep line back from existing stock water and stock water wells powered by wind or electricity.
- magnetic fields on existing livestock fencing, existing livestock wells powered by wind or electricity.
- Keep line back from existing stock water and stock water wells powered by wind or electricity.
- 1S/62W/ Sec 10,11 are irrigated production agriculture.
- There are 3 irrigation wells and 1 domestic well immediately adjacent to the proposed L22 route of Big Sandy to Green Valley.
- Sheet map 31 3) As C5 heads south, it should begin 1/2 mile earlier than proposed but stay in west half of section 12 & 13 to stay away from irrigation on Sec. 14 and house as it travels further south.
- Sheet map 31 2) As C5 begins, line should remain on Sec. 10 & 11 to stay away from irrigation and dry land as much as possible.
- Sheet map 31 4) We are strongly opposed to C6 & C4 as they cross by nice houses and our feedlot and many irrigated parcels. Please contact me if you have questions as to our comments.

Agriculture

- Sheet map 31 4) We are strongly opposed to C6 & C4 as they cross by nice houses and our feedlot and many irrigated parcels. Please contact me if you have questions as to our comments.
- This land we farm in a square section and by placing the line in the middle of their property will cause us to work around the line.
- B3 17-23-34. We have an irrigation well located in the SW corner of this section. If the line runs over the well it would be difficult to work on the line with power in there.
- A family lives in and upon Owl Canyon Property. Cattle are also being raised in such area. Clearly, submitting a family and livestock to this amount of kilovolts is an unacceptable health risk.
- This office has been engaged to represent numerous property owners with farms, residences, businesses, and property holdings along the proposed J4 electrical transmission line route from the Midway substation to the Big Sandy substation, part of the Eastern Plains Transmission Project.
- In particular, the location of electrical transmission lines across active farmland will reduce the agricultural productivity of the property, whereas the same would not be the case with grazing land.
- A principal objection to this route arises out of the fact that as it crosses Townships 10 and 11 South, Range 56 West, it passes through property which is almost exclusively active farm land.
- One of your EPTP brochures suggests that flammables should not be placed within the easement area of the power lines. Obviously, active farming activity involves a greater use of an dependence on flammable materials, such as fuel products, than a ranch or grazing use of the property.
- More importantly, the livestock grazing use of property is more compatible with electrical transmission lines than farming.
- Active farming activity also includes the use of automatic sprinklers and sophisticated machinery which includes global positioning systems, electronics, and sophisticated computerized equipment.
- In addition, locating the transmission lines on active farmland will adversely impact the ability to conduct agricultural aviation activities necessary on that property as it will create a greater danger in the conduct of those activities and will result in an increased cost to the farmers contracting for agricultural aviation work (assuming that the individuals involved in that industry will provide those services to areas crossed by or under transmission lines).
- My concerns are as follows: The presence of these towers and lines will decrease the value of my farm ground.
- My concerns are as follows: The 500kV towers will make it more costly and less effective to farm the ground.

Agriculture

- I am a land owner in the area of the proposed J4 line. All of this land is farm ground and is actively being farmed. 480 acres of my farms will be adversely affected with towers and lines of the 500kV line.
- My concerns are as follows: The towers and lines will make it nearly impossible to hire an aerial applicator for crop spraying purposes.
- I don't like it going through our farmland as it will be a nuisance farming around and will devalue the property.
- What is the impact on animals in the areas? Domesticated, farms, and wildlife animals.
- The effect of the magnetic field on ag equipment (Computers).
- Taking farmland out of production.
- The effect on air plane traffic/spray planes.
- Objections to proposed Route J4 as shown on Sheet Map 9: J4 is now proposed for some 3 miles to pass along the borders of land owned and farmed by one family, Larry and Grace Skinner and Opal Skinner, and to pass within a quarter mile of the skinner residence located on Lincoln County Road 2W. That is a serious impact in terms of home and land value reduction, and cost and inconvenience of farming operations.
- Alternative suggestions to proposed Route J4: If the above suggestion is not possible, then please reconsider alternative routes J1 or J3/J5. Those routes both cross less farmland and more rangeland that does J4, through sparsely settled areas. Lower acquisition costs, lower damage and loss of production claims.
- Objections to proposed Route J4 as shown on Sheet Map 9: Along the proposed Route J4 as it runs from Limon south to a point approximately 13 miles south of Limon, then turns southwesterly, crosses highway 71, and passes off of Sheet Map 9, it directly impacts at least 10 residences in terms of view and electrical interferences. That would not be as true of an alternative such as J1, since the pastureland is more sparsely settled.
- Alternative suggestions to proposed Route J4: Since Western must acquire easement/right of way for the 230kV line from Big Sandy substation to 125 mile substation (N1, N2, N3, or N4), could that also accommodate the 500 kV line that must go to Midway? That line then could proceed from 125 mile south and connect with J3/J5 to reach midway. Less easement acquisition, less farmland, more rangeland, sparsely settled.
- Objections to proposed Route J4 as shown on Sheet Map 9: As J4 crosses Townships 10S and 11S, R56W, it passes through or borders some 16 sections, nearly all of which is ACTIVE FARMLAND. It seems that selection of a route such as J1 that uses primarily range/pasture land would result in lower costs for acquisition of easements/rights of way (land values are lower) and less loss of agricultural productivity, since livestock grazing is more compatible with transmission lines than is farming.
- Your alternate would encompass less farm ground.

Agriculture

- This line will make it nearly impossible to aerial spray our crops, & very hard to farm around.
- difficult to farm around.
- Having aerial sprayers get around or under lines.
- Segment G4 on Map 22 in T8S, R50W, Secs. 7, 8, & 18- Proposed route has been revised in this area. Prefer the original alignment. Currently uses Z road for takeoff and landing for crop spraying. Would be even better about one mile to the south.
- does not agree with project – it isn't needed – he has enough power; build generation on front range and leave him alone; concern about farming around structures for the rest of his life; no amount of money can pay for that; wife discussed option of putting line on north side of existing line between Big Sandy and Burlington because of CRP land and absentee owners (noted on map) -- husband doesn't like that either because he would still have to look at it and doesn't think project is needed. Lee and Carey talked to extensively.
- Ryan Weaver (Group) – move preferred alternative from Burlington to Energy Center ½ mile west south of K Road; Paconic Road is main road for planting and harvest; most activity in July and September; grain bins discussed; also close to house on east side of 55 Road (Roger Clevanaugh?).
- Lance Whitey – prefers single pole in agricultural land; otherwise, opposes preferred alternative.
- Gilbert – cropland 14-15 miles north of Big Sandy; can line be moved to west field line (drawn on map).
- Bob Wilger – grazing land use converted to dry crops in T21SR43W, Section 2; alternative drawn on Sheet 36; requested that single steel poles be used; requested annual payments for easements.
- concern about herbicide application; more on inside and less on outside when driving tractor around structures.
- Delmas Beaman – T18SR43W, Section 25; reroutes drawn on Sheet 27 to avoid diagonal in cultivated field; shift to north; grain bins at corner and to west.
- Skip Crist – concern with spanning ½ mile pivots; also concern with where structures will be located next to roads.
- Group – same comments as above + placement of towers adjacent to roads and existing lines; concern with getting equipment between.
- Clede Widener – concern with getting equipment between (wheat drills are 60 feet wide) in area between existing Xcel line and new line; prefers to have 140-145' between H-frame lines (Energy Center to Lamar).
- Ms. Schlagel (husband on Tri-State Board) – concern with dry land south of 152nd; irrigated on north side; prefers east and north of preferred Big Sandy to Green Valley route; could build—not that rough; prefers not to use segment L10; cuts diagonal through north ½ of section 25, T4SR65W.

Agriculture

- Dean Wieser – T5SR44W, Section 6; Avoid pivot and corner that is cultivated on Burlington to Wray preferred alternative.
- Dale Johnson – T14SR40W, Section 32; not in favor of line cutting across pasture; prefers alternative on south and west (this still surrounds him on 3 sides with existing line on east); pasture has well and was previously irrigated—still has water rights and could re-install pivot; 2 pivots on ½ section to south; consider going on south side so he isn't surrounded (owner is Dwayne Frasier); also concern with CRP compliance (has 1/8 mile of cedar trees). Also owns land north of Holly near Energy Center (T21SR41W, Section 6 and S ½ Section 1, T21SR42W)—no problem with line crossing here.
- Dale Johnson – T14SR40W, Section 32; not in favor of line cutting across pasture; prefers alternative on south and west (this still surrounds him on 3 sides with existing line on east); pasture has well and was previously irrigated – still has water rights and could re-install pivot; 2 pivots on ½ section to south; consider going on south side so he isn't surrounded (owner is Dwayne Frasier); also concern with CRP compliance (has 1/8 mile of cedar trees). Also owns land north of Holly near Energy Center (T21SR41W, Section 6 and S ½ Section 1, T21SR42W)—no problem with line crossing here.
- Dale Mauck (Kenneth property) – Big Sandy to Beaver Creek has quonset and grain bins near line; Big Sandy to Burlington prefers route be located on grass/not agricultural.
- Norbert Pekarek – there are no alternatives on his land; he has no concerns with the project; he pointed out grain bins on 55 Road (Paconic Road), 1 ½ mile south of K Road.
- When you have two adjacent lines it is very difficult to farm around them.
- Would like the line to be located at least 60 feet in from the road so we can more easily maintain the area between the section line/road and the structures. Easier to control weeds. Equipment is 40-60 feet wide and we want to be able to maneuver completely around the structures.
- Do not split farmland.
- Skip Crist- How do you plan to span the ½ mile center pivots? We see how you propose to do it for the ¼ mile pivots.
- Jacob Wagers: We have grain bins, and a homestead near K-11, Along E Road—25 road and E road.
- There is a loss of productivity around these structures for the life of the project.
- T1S R45W Section 24. Which side of the road will the line be on? NE1/4 is farmland, NW1/4 is grass.
- The economic impact is less on grazing than on farmland.
- Aerial applicators may not work around big transmission lines. It is too dangerous. There will be a long way where they cannot fly; the quality of the application will go down.

Agriculture

- Hugh Scherrer: Aerial application is difficult. It is difficult to control weeds around these structures with aerial application; it must be done by hand. I have a 90-foot boom on my weed control applicator.
- Glenn Benjamin: I would like the line to run along N4—this is more on grassland and less on farmland.
- Skip Crist- Either make the space between the structures and the road or section line wide enough to farm around with modern equipment or make it small enough so there is not “dead space” that can not be reached. We do not have equipment small enough to do a 30 or 40 foot width.
- You will drastically interfere with the aerial applicators—this will cause a permanent increase in cost and lost productivity in the farmland.
- Road F.00- on K-11- There is a lot of good pasture land along this route.
- We do not want you to divide agland.
- Matt Witt: There is a center pivot, feed lot, house, and farmland. T7S R50W, 17, 18, 19, 20.
- Do not run down middle of section through irrigated farmland, stay in grassland/range land whenever possible. T24S R34W 13 and 14.
- Hugh Scherrer: T11S R58 W Sec 16 The old line crosses at a diagonal across property. Farming operations are difficult. The new line will make it many times worse to farm.
- There is a loss of productivity around these structures for the life of the project.
- Move your line onto range land.
- Skip Crist- Relationship of the Towers and road or Section Line. Would like the structures further out from the section line so machinery can move around to farm and control weeds.
- Do not split the farmland along the north-south part of J4 How will the electrical lines affect the computer controls on machinery, for example the spraying controls on big sprayers?
- She wants to grow organic things and the transmission line will interfere with that.
- Mr. Neil Howell who tenant farms his Mother's property and land held by the Irlene Richardson Trust (legal descriptions below).
- His equipment needs up to 120 feet of clearance from the edge of the section.
- In addition to that, he would hope that we will off-set an additional 60ft to accommodate his farm equipment in order for him to get around the towers.
- Many times there are other wildlife on this grass. Once you establish a road or trail we can count on unwanted traffic through these areas. Not good for the grass, livestock, or the wildlife.
- At some point we need to be concerned with a tower coming down or a line down, especially if it crosses a fence line. My concern is not only for the livestock (who tend to bunch up along a fence in a storm) but for our own safety as well.

Agriculture

- Secondly, there is precious little native grass left in Northern Kearny County, and it is precious. Not only is this grass used by livestock, but also by the area's wildlife. They need a quiet and safe refuge.
- We will be affected by this power line no matter which route it takes. However, we would rather deal with the towers through the fields and the compaction problems that will go with it- in the fields, rather than in the native grass (where compaction will mean erosion).
- Your alternate route <J3 & J5> would also encompass less farm ground.
- The effect to people and cattle. Now and in the future.
- What are the health concerns toward cattle and people? Have you done studies that confirm 100% that the lines do not affect livestock and human health? Remember people eat the cattle also!
- Mountain View came in to replace an underground line across my pasture and fields following the big line. They surveyed and staked 2 miles and did not contact me. I went to farm and here were all of those stakes in the field that were in the path of my irrigation sprinkler. TOTALLY UNACPETABLE [sic].
- If they contacted me they would not have had to re survey and stake, but I still have the boxes to farm around and no one from the State or Mountain View takes care of the weeds growing around the boxes. In grassland cattle can graze around them and has very little impact.
- With the proposed Eastern Plains Transmission Project maps in front of me, I cannot tell if the proposed lines go across my irrigated land or where they go. These are such vague maps that I don't know if I need to object or try to correct a line route that I can live with.
- You cross over the present line on Section 3 into my farm ground and angle across Section 4-8-53 farm ground. Stay on the south side of the existing line.
- The F line from Lamar to Limon would make the least impact on the farm land as most of this route is on pasture.
- land, the G4 line will impact my farmland. I have a power line across my land now and it is a terrible inconvenience to try to farm around the pole and brace structure.
- Our soil is very fragile how will cropland be protected from traffic so as to not damage productivity.
- Will ariel [sic] application be effected [sic] in applying herbicides, insecticides.
- Take farm land out of production.
- Can you farm under these lines?
- Static electricity causing hair on cattle to stand up.
- Will there be effects on instrument panels, spray planes, tractors, combines, etc.

Agriculture

- Proposed Route N2: Big Sandy to 125-Mile: This 230 kV line would cross River Bend Ranch from east to west, starting at T8S/ R57W/ S30, and running west/southwest for five miles through T8S/ R58W/ S28. we accept the routing of this proposed route, as it avoids any conflict with our ranch operations and follows a direct line with minimal visual impact.
- If proposed route K9 is chosen then we would request a change in its route. Specifically we would suggest that it make its turn at T4S/ R55W/ S35 (three miles to the north of where proposed). This would allow both lines to cross the public road at the same place, reducing its visual impact, and in addition would avoid some of the rougher terrain encountered in Township 5S. There would also not be homes, farmsteads or driveways along a more northern route.
- Very difficult to farm around towers with today's machinery.
- I do not want any towers on my land! Farmable land will be taken.
- These scoping comments for the Eastern Plains Transmission Project are submitted on behalf of Frost Livestock Co. ("Frost Livestock"), a Colorado family corporation formed on January 26, 1962 by Jon and Mary Frost. The principal business address for Frost Livestock Co. is 183530 Hanover Road, Pueblo, CO 81008. Frost Livestock owns private land that could be impacted by the Boone Substation to Midway Substation segment of the Transmission Project. Frost Livestock also leases public land for grazing purposes in the vicinity of the proposed transmission lines. Frost livestock strongly objects to the location of any electrical transmission lines or related facilities on its private property.
- The ranch operations consist primarily of cattle grazing and hay production, with some acreage recently devoted to vegetable farming.
- In the 21st century, it is increasingly difficult for small family farms such as the Frost Livestock Co. to earn a reasonable return from agricultural operations.
- Frost Livestock has labored vigorously for decades to maintain a large expanse of land intact with minimal fragmentation. The criteria used to evaluate alternatives should place the highest value on large areas of contiguous productive agricultural lands under common ownership because these lands are increasingly rare and valuable due to rampant development on surrounding properties.
- Frost Livestock owns 5,400 acres of deeded land and 18,000 acres of grazing rights on public land. The lands owned and leased by Frost Livestock are valuable and productive agricultural properties that form an integral part of Colorado's natural and cultural heritage.
- Finally, additional power lines and related facilities will increase electromagnetic fields on the ranch, creating the potential for harm to wildlife, livestock and area residents.
- Frost Livestock operations help sustain the local agricultural economy.
- Financial compensation provided to landowners whose property is burdened with power lines is insufficient to mitigate the long-term deleterious [sic] effects to family-owned agricultural lands and the natural resources they support.

Agriculture

- The potential cumulative impacts of these projects on the continued viability of the existing agricultural operations must be examined in the EIS.
- On sheet map 1, in brown marker, Section 27, NE corner of section 34, section 22, in township 1N, Range 64W, Weld county, Colorado. M3 route is preferred to avoid disruption to active producing farm land on alternative route M4.
- She is concerned with that size of a facility on her property because it will significantly impact her farming operation. She prefers that the facility not be on her property but that M3 or M5 be selected. She will send in comments as well.
- Section 27 is the location of the proposed EPTP alternate power line route and switching station site (identified as M4). For the following reasons, you should choose M3 as the preferred route: 1. The alternate route (M4) runs right through the middle of active producing farm land that supports the livelihood of four families. The alternate proposed M4 switching station (as I was informed by your engineers) would consume 5-10 acres of land in the center of this producing farms, taking it out of production permanently. This does not take into account access roads required to maintain the facility. This reduction in producing farm land would cause unreasonable hardship.
- Section 27 is the location of the proposed EPTP alternate power line route and switching station site (identified as M4). For the following reasons, you should choose M3 as the preferred route: 3. The alternate route on section 27 does not make good economic sense. The alternate route comes from the south, then doglegs one-half mile to the west, and then turns north again, right through the middle of section 27. This dogleg is purported to be due to a non-residential structure (small tank) on section 26. Yet, this dogleg runs adjacent to a tank, pump house and pit, not to mention an active oil well on the SE corner of section 27. Every turn increases the number of power poles on the property and increases EPTP costs dramatically. If the M4 alternate route is in fact selected, it would make more sense, economically, to minimize the length of the east-west dogleg (staying as close to the eastern property line as possible.) Not only would EPTP save the cost of wire for this 1/2 mile segment, it would reduce the impact on our farming operations.
- The irrigation circles that have been there for 5 years and as a power roll irrigator for 2 years are in this same area.
- These areas that you proposed to put the transmission power lines are my livelihood for both my hunting preserve and my hay and cattle business. The hay that is planted in the circles irrigation provides financial income for my family and feed for my own cattle and the stubble that is left after cutting is for my hunting preserve.
- The proposed power lines would affect my irrigation, water rights, hunting preserve business and hay business. It would cost me money to move the center pivots that I have had at these locations for 5 years on my land.

Agriculture

- I am very concerned about section 21-11-56. It is a hay meadow that is very wet because it is sub-irrigated. It would easily be damaged by machinery and vehicles because it is so wet.
- We use aerial sprayers for our agriculture ground and this will greatly affect not only the cost to have the ground sprayed but will also make it difficult to find an applicator willing to spray close to these towers and lines.
- The proposed J4 line crosses 1 1/2 miles of farm ground that we farm. Another 1 1/2 miles of farm ground that we own lies in the easement area so could possible also contain the towers.
- There will be a decline in value of our residence and our farm ground.
- Our residence is located in the NW corner of section 3-11-56 & we own and farm the entire section.
- The proposed J4 line runs approximately 1/4 mile from our farmstead including our residences and a rental mobile home. We have many concerns about the line being that close.
- Other ground involved with the proposed J4 line that we own or farm: NW 1/4 28-10-56, E 1/2 33-10-56, all of 3-11-56, N1/2 of 10-11-56.
- All farming operations such as spraying, tilling, and planting around the towers would be more costly and can not be as efficiently done.
- Impact on localized agricultural land is effected.
- To whom it may concern: Our home is located on the SE 1/4 of 28-7-56. This proposed route (map 7, L2) would pass 1/2 mile west of our home site and would pass through over 1/2 mile of farmland. This site is on the half mile line and not on a section line.
- We already have two existing high lines crossing much of the ground we farm. We are in the process of purchasing Sec 21 T7S R56W. We have farmed this ground for 55 years.
- We also have a quonset and grain bins on Sec 27 T7S R56W. Your plans are to follow that line. Will you move all the buildings and bins?
- The Metro District land applies biosolids to certain fields within the METROGRO Farm at any given time. It is not necessarily the typical seasonal type farming operation throughout the year. There could also be any number of special projects taking place on the Farm at any given time, such as road projects, conservation projects, on-going research projects, chemical spraying, etc.
- Based on current proposed routes, a large portion of our farm is crossed at a diagonal (45 degrees). Would it be possible to route the lines along Range & township boundaries and create one 90-degree turn instead of two 45 degree turns?
- We have a longstanding research project on METROGRO Farm and there are concerns that construction and/or permanent presence of the transmission line will compromise the integrity of the project. This project has been continuous since the early 1990s and is expected to continue through at least 2011.

Agriculture

- What kind of impact will construction activities as well as on-going maintenance activities have on our farming and biosolids land application operations?
- Yoder and Rush are developing communities. We have lots of children in our area, livestock, and wells.
- My farming operation in Eastern Colorado would be seriously hindered by transmission lines across the property. Please include this comment in the EIS scoping process.
- Mr. Shimon would like an aerial map of his property that would show the proximity of the proposed route in relation to his property. Mr. Shimon also sent in a comment form that stated he planned to put a sprinkler on his farm.
- Alternative suggestions to proposed route J4: Since Western must acquire easement/right of way for the 230 kV line from Big Sandy substation to 125 mile substation (N1 and N2, or N3, or N4) could that also accommodate the 500kV line that must go to Midway? That line then could proceed from 125 mile south and connect with J3/J5 to reach Midway. Less easement acquisition, less farmland, more rangeland, sparsely settled.
- As J4 crosses Townships 10S and 11S, R56W it passes through or borders some 16 sections, nearly all of which is ACTIVE FARMLAND. It seems that selection of a route such as J1 that uses primarily range, pasture land would result in lower costs for acquisition of easements/ rights of way (land values are lower) and less loss of agricultural productivity, since livestock grazing is more compatible with transmission lines than is farming.
- Midway substation to Big Sandy Substation proposed route J4: this route (J4) is mostly over active farmland. J1 or J3 are mostly over range (pasture) land. Farmland is valued at about 4 times that of pasture land. Farmland is more densely settled. Your acquisition costs will be must higher and your damage settlements for loss of productivity will be much higher on farm land than on range land.
- If the above suggestion is not possible, then please reconsider alternative routes J1 or J3/J5. Those routes both cross less farmland and more rangeland than does j4, through sparsely settled areas. Lower acquisition costs, lower damage and loss of production claims.
- Please consider any alternative for this line that goes west, rather than south of Limon across pasture rather than farmland, and that impacts fewer residences. You will have to cross Interstate 70 and the Big Sandy Creek either way, so that is not a factor.
- Along the proposed Route J4 as it runs from Limon south to a point approximately 13 miles south of Limon, then turns southwesterly, crosses highway 71, and passes off of Sheet Map 9, it directly impacts at least 10 residences in terms of view and electrical interferences. That would not be as true of an alternative such as J1, since the pastureland is more sparsely settled.
- I may engage in agricultural activity, and will probably have a number of horses and other animals on the property.

Agriculture

- I own land in Arapahoe County that is in the path of the proposed routes. The schedule number for my land is 1989-00-0-00-149. This is a 35 acre parcel, roughly square, which was farmed until 2003. The southeast corner of my land is the intersection of County Road 241 and County Road 18.
- Our animals have no water when the electricity is interrupted, and we have to check all of the automatic waterers every time there is a power surge. Our farm sprinklers shut off every time there is a power surge. It is not that simple, short interruption of service that rights itself in a split second. There are major impacts whenever we lose power even if it is temporary.
- I travel long distances to work, to medical services, even to the grocery store because my husband and his brothers have chosen to farm and feed cattle.
- In general, an irrigated crop or land that is served by a sprinkler raises a higher value crop than dryland farmground. It appears that your alternate route L16 might impact irrigated ground less than dryland ground.
- There is one residence and other farm structures on each of the parcels. The cattle and horses are at 68851 East 88th avenue. The ground is primarily irrigated farm ground with four pivot sprinklers on the 640 acre parcel and two pivot sprinklers on the 320 acre parcel. Traditionally, the crops include corn, grass hay, alfalfa hay, wheat and millet. The dryland corners are planted to wheat or millet in a rotation cycle.
- Working in the field is most efficient when there are no structures in the way, and working around those structures.
- wastes a lot of ground when you are working with the large tractors that are necessary in modern farm operations. Since we farm two places within a few miles of each other, the relative light traffic and lack of construction on our dirt roads is also important as we move that large equipment from one farm to the other.
- We are part of the "State of Colorado" state tax payers, both on income and property yet you say you can't go through state land where nothing but cattle graze, no homes are on this land.
- Our home will be within the one mile corridor, I'm concerned about our community investments, future investing, property devaluation health of my family and myself and our livestock.
- My children, family, horses, animals, house, barn, neighbors, and what effects it will have.
- Small children, horses, dogs, cattle, barn, house.
- Do you promise that it will not hurt my land? Or the property value?
- When considering all routes, every effort should be made to preserve existing farmground. Following section lines would definitely be the best routes to choose.
- K11 is a much better alternative because it won't go through as much farmground. K9 & K10 cuts through the middle of a large amount of farmground. It is a bad choice.
- Impact less farmground. When these lines get to the county line between Lincoln & Washington counties it would be best for them to follow L1 to the west until it become L3.

Agriculture

- This route would impact less farmland than the proposed L2. The proposed L2 is the worst possible route the way it cuts through so much farmground.
- G3 impacts a large amount of farmland G4 would be better than G3, but G5 is by far the best option of these three because it would be mostly on grassland.
- As a landowner, farmer, tenant, and aerial application pilot I would like to see monopoles used as it makes weed control and all our operations easier.
- In purple of blue marker, N 1/2 of section 27: NW of section 35, SW, SWSE of Section 6 T21S, R43W, Sixth PM, Prowers county, Colorado. In addition to these parcels we have Ag/aircraft spray strips as indicated on the maps and at the 2/21/2007 Lamar Meeting.
- I would also like to address the continual problem of adopting changes in cultural practices especially fieldwork and spraying are a continual expense for the owner operators or tenant and really need to be considered as an ongoing expense long after the power line is completed. The operator will have to deal with the additional time and expense for perpetually.
- Terraces will be built sometime soon.
- It looks like to us that the proposed routes will be putting two more lines across our land. We already have 1 line and we feel that the other two would really ruin our land for being able to farm the land.
- The lines would devalue the property would make it hard to farm and to be able to get all of the weeds cleared our so bugs would probably take over and damage crops.
- We have built terraces on N1/2 27-21--43 to control soil erosion. The double sets of poles make maintenance of the terraces very difficult.
- Double sets of poles on Road SS (N1/2) impacts our farm ground and ability to effectively spray and control weeds with our spray plane.
- Maintaining and building terraces contracted with the National Resources Conservation Service will be very difficult because of the large metal poles.
- Prefer the poles be mono-poles and located on the south side of the roads to minimize impact on terrace.
- In blue or purple marker N1/2 of section 27, NW of section 27; NW of section 35, SWSE of section 6 T21S, R43W, 6th PM, Prowers County, Colorado. Our aerial application landing strips were marked on the map- road SS north of Bristol, CO.
- We own and live on section 14 1s 63w and maps we have seen show the proposed line coming through this section. We presently have 2 center pivot irrigation sprinklers and have plans to put 2 more up and this would not be possible with the proposed line coming through this section.
- What is the setback distance of the line from farm homes, corrals, wells, etc.?
- What is the setback distance of the line from farm homes, corrals, wells, etc.? [duplicate of above_w.p].

Agriculture

- Mr. Howard is concerned because the SW corner of his property abuts the NE corner of the Bohart Ranch. The jog in the route would move the line much closer to his property. He much prefers the more northern alternative in the area.
- We want single poles vs. towers that are projected because: farming easier around pole vs. tower, not as much waste and land needed for production to feed our county, weed control will be eliminated by you under a tower.
- Big Sandy to Green Valley: L2 needs to be located next to and parallel to K1 with both being on the west side of the existing line from Big Sandy to Beaver Creek until it almost (sic) the Washington-Lincoln county line and then follow L1 to the west until it become L3, This option avoids the Western Union tower located in sec 2 6S 56W, Less farmland would be impacted with this route rather than the proposed L2 route.
- Big Sandy to Beaver Creek: K1 needs to stay on west side of existing line all of the way to Beaver Creek, the K9 and K10 jog back to the east side of Highway 71 would affect too much farmland, K11 a lot better option than K9 & K10.
- Burlington to Big Sandy: G3 a terrible option because of the farmland impacts, G4 better option than G3 but not as good as G5, G5 best option because most of it is on grassland.
- If these are our only options, we will in no way consider your power lines cutting through the center of our property and will use any and every legal option available to us to stop this action. I look forward in hearing from you regarding this manner.
- The land in question has been in our family for over 70 years. We are not overly receptive about your power lines running down our North property line, but the alternative route is more of a negotiable option. As indicated on your map, the alternate route on Sanborn road would put the line on an unimproved road and on the property line (versus the center of the section). It would also be beneficial to you financially because the alternate route would be 1 mile shorter than the proposed route. Our proposal would be to choose the alternative route for the 2 miles and stay on the property line.
- Mr. Richie asked if line G5 was a Proposed or Alternative line segment. It is an alternative; he was satisfied with that information. He asked if they would be towers, at this point G5 is 500kV and they are proposed at this time to be lattice towers. He asked if the right of way would be split on section lines, the answer was that if it is depicted on a section line the ROW / Easement would be secured on one side of the "line" the ROW would not be split by a section line. I mentioned that he could view aerial photos and comment at the scoping meetings listed in the information he received. Rudy Apodaca - 1/24/07 Sec 13 - T 10S - R 51W, Sec 18 - T 10S - R 50W, Sec 17 - T 10S - R 50W.
- Mr. Wieser would like us to move the "jog" in H2 further south before the angle is used. I suggested he attend a scoping meeting to add this concern to the oversize maps used to capture route issues (center pivot irrigation). He will be attending in Burlington. T 5S - R 44W.

Agriculture

- Should you go with the proposed route (Energy Center to Big Sandy) I would like to see you keep it as close to Hwy 287-40 as possible as to make access to the line less intrusive to all land owners.
- Do not want on or near my land [damaged].
- Next, an "alternative route" was indicated on the maps we received from you. I respectfully request that you utilize the "alternative route" instead of the proposed route which will cut right through our property and run over or near our residence. The proposed high-voltage transmission line will directly depreciate our property value.
- I personally would like to see the project to be completed because I understand the need, since I am a retired employee of the Mountain View Electric Association.
- If you go straight across it as shown it is not too bad, why don't you put it next to the road north of my land? [road k].
- N3 goes through bottom ground- difficult to service and floods. N2 and N4 preferred.
- Move (F7) north 1 mile where it jogs NW near state land.
- How sure is the proposed route vs. the alternate routes?
- I would suggest staying next to the existing line (proposed route) north of Flagler and Arriba in Lincoln county maps.
- Makes more sense to follow existing lines. Especially G4, north of Arriba.
- Suggest following F5 to F8 to Lincoln county line, then (sic) to F7.

Alternatives

- The proposed alignment of the 500kV line 6 miles North of Arriba appears to be acceptable if the affected landowners are fairly compensated.
- Pleased with the proposal to build the new 500 kV line parallel with the existing 230 kV line. Burlington to Big Sandy impact would be minimal if this route is chosen. My residence was directly underneath the original proposal last September. Please don't put the line on CR3N.
- Parallel to the existing line is the very best proposal. Thank you!
- We like the J4 route.
- the G5 line would be the best alternative.
- The G4 line would be so wide. G5 would be best alternative.
- On the G4 line the southern route of G5 would be the best due to far less farm ground involved. Much more grass land and less tillable fields and less people.
- Also proposed route G4 is preferred to alternative G3 coming out of Limon Substation (Big Sandy).

Alternatives

- Proposed alternative routes K5 and L2 are preferred and I want them to stay in the corridors presented @ public meetings in Limon on Feb 13, 2007.
- The alternative line G5 from Burlington to Limon make the most sense.
- Prefer to keep route along County, Rd 71. Road becomes a trail in section 10. Good Access.
- I see nothing that would bother me with this plan.
- Will you consider wind energy?
- The C7 and C5 would be better for us. The line would still be on our land in several places. But not in our front view. That's very important to me.
- C6 & C2 running south of Burlington would not work for us. That line would be in my front window.
- We prefer the location of C5 and absolutely do not want C2 or C4.
- Prefer alt. route H3.
- H2- T4S R45W Sec. 25 Our house seems to be under the proposed line. See map 30 or 29 for proposal to move it.
- We do not like the south of I-70 route because it will affect our property.
- Burlington to Big Sandy- We prefer the proposed along the existing transmission line.
- Has home directly under proposed route segment A7, two alternatives drawn.
- I like proposed route G6 & G4 Big Sandy to Burlington.
- Do not go on Route G3.
- I prefer you stay away from the alternative J3 route. We already have one line.
- Proposed routine.
- We are in agreence (sic) with the proposed routes.
- I am pleased with the proposed route. I am located on map 11 Rd 108- and ramphd (sic) Rd. (108 is Judge Orr Rd.).
- I am delighted that Morgan County is interested in alternative energy sources. I feel we could use another cite [sic] for the location. I would be delighted to have a power transmission project located midway between Wiggins and Ft. Morgan.
- Of the options from Beaver Creek I would prefer Big Sandy to Beaver Creek (East Route).
- Would prefer J9 over J10.
- Would prefer I 2/4 over I 1 (bad).
- Doesn't see any major issues on EC-BS, EC-Burl, Burl-BS, Burl-Wray, BS-BC.
- I would favor the eastern most route of the Brush-Beaver Creek to Big Sandy Substation.

Alternatives

- Prefers proposed route- would have fewer effects.
- If moved north & closer or to the north of existing line, it would be easier.
- Concerned about C4 crossing middle of fields, property along C4, most of T19S, R43W.
- Burlington to Big Sandy. The original proposed line makes the most sense to me. To follow a already existing line.
- T14S R60W- Sec. 28 & 29. Keep route south of McCurdy road as proposed in Feb 07.
- Stay with your proposed positions- through our property in Kansas.
- T25S R36W Sec23, 25, 36. Route A2. Homes (3) near route. Possibility of moving if not other way. (3 of them) + electric, sewer, etc.
- Prefers proposed route on B7, not B6, also not hand drawn re-route (along draw).
- Do not shift the marked diagonals east which would cut into my land.
- T21S R41W. Proposed route A7 from Energy Center to Rolling Hills is OK as shown.
- Proposed Rolling Hills to Burlington 500-kV line runs right through property near town of Tribune, KS.
- Sheet map 46- should follow section lines/ roads.
- Prefer line to follow section lines/ county roads.
- Drew several re-route possibilities (In Red on map).
- More residences along A1 than are shown on maps. Fewer residences on A2 in that area. (David Goertzen is my name).
- I prefer A2 over A1. A1 affects my son's proposed home site (Ryan Goertzen) Sec 12 T25S 36W.
- I prefer A6, A4 will not work.
- I am also against A7.
- B4 also obstructs our views and ruins the environment.
- B-7 Sec. 25, 15, 10, 9, and 5.
- 2 & B, n and 16, T21S. R35W.
- Don't want it though the grassland- prefer the farmground. Own both but concerned it would have a negative effect on cattle.
- Sect. TWN, RNG:07-2-55 Desc. N 1/2, NE 1/4, & SE1/4, NE 1/4.
- Tomky property not affected by K11.
- on K10 wanted to know where project was located in relation to T. Line.
- School was directly adjacent to original alternative corridor. Satisfied with move of segment C4 in T18S R43W, Map 27.

Alternatives

- This would not add further line but would get closer to some of the best wind in the state.
- I am from Baca county and interested in wind generation.
- I would ask for further consideration of the April 2006 study that showed lines coming west from the Rolling Hills substation into Colorado and then north into the Lamar substation.
- I approve of this line places south of the existing line.
- If it would go straight north along the east side of 25 and cross highway 96 at that point- it would be more acceptable. It could jog west in the next mile or two north of Hwy 96.
- If the transmission line from Limon to Lamar must indeed be constructed the Hammer Ranch requests that the alternate route F5 be followed to the point where it dissects county road 2 thence north to the point where it meets route F7 then follow that route to Limon.
- This would move the line away from the close proximity to the Tony Hammer residence located near Road M in the S half of section 6, township 15 S, Range 50 W.
- F1- prefer location S of the Kiowa/ Prowers lines.
- Prefer D3 to D4. D4 is least preferred of the 3.
- Line location is generally OK. S side of Rd SS is generally better. S of Xcel line.
- T21S R44W on map 36 in purple marker is his location.
- Prefer that the line be on the West side of 22 Rd. on grassland not on farmland.
- Segment J4, Map 9, T11S, R 56W, Sec 3 SW 1/4 is home and other buildings.
- We want single steel pole on F1 where you go on our property.
- Map 26, Segment F1, T12S, R34W, Sec. 3/2 is location.
- I live on CO Hwy 71 North of Limon CO in T8S R56W and I want the proposed route for Beaver Creek- Green Valley transmission line to stay east of Hwy 71 as shown @ public meetings in Limon CO on Feb. 13, 2007.
- Please place towers to the edge of property section lines so there is greatest limit of loss of farming ability.
- Recommend C5 East line local landowners OK. Second comment choice F3 over F2.
- Put the line on a section line do not set it in the field any further than necessary. As close as the easement will allow.
- I prefer the east alternative C5 as long as the local landowners are satisfied I prefer F3 over F2.
- Frontier Sportsman Club (see Steve Weber) We prefer J13 (immediately south of existing line).
- Look at Hwy 71 possibilities.
- 2 attachments- additional houses, potential option.
- Fessinger road over to state land would miss a lot of home owners.

Alternatives

- My main concern is with the proposed route. I didn't want it on Sanborn Road. It would literally be in my front yard.
- Alternative route close to family farming land.
- I have no problem with the alternative route at this time.
- I do favor the proposed route.
- I would like to see more wind and solar energy sources utilized. Those are plentiful resources along the proposed route. Only thing to stop the wind is barbed wire.
- Would prefer J10, but if J7 is chosen, would almost rather have it over her house (and buy her out) rather than re-aligned but close-by.
- We should consider a field meeting with residents on J4 to route area south of Sanborn Road and Yoder Road.
- Therefore, I feel it is important to avoid as many homes and populated areas as possible.
- I feel Route J-4 is the best route to minimize the number of existing homes and ranches affected.
- Consider relocate of B18 to go through soil bank vs. over farmland at T10S, R41W, Sec 13, NW 1/4.
- B13 will be less "offensive" in the Western Kansas area because it travels through open pasture for cattle, away from residences.
- I would like you to use option B13 rather than option B14.
- Stay with proposed route B11, B14, & B18.
- We want you to stay with the proposed route from Rolling Hills to Burlington and not go on our property.
- Alternative Route B13 goes just east of our property T12S R36W Sections 30 & 31.
- I would like to see alternative B-11 happen, since Tribune, Kansas is a small town that needs help economically. This community is hurting, and any boost to the tax base would help tremendously.
- See attached map for proposed routes for EPTP- red lines on map.
- See map for routes that make sense.
- L-14 and L-12 are BAD. There is too much development in this area.
- I have a preference that you follow L-9 and L-15. An even better route would be the suggested route east of L-9 that follows east of range 59 traveling north to south
- I would like far east line suggested by us local people marked for study.
- Why not go way east and pass over metro grows land this is ruined anyway that country is flat with nobody living there. It has no water and will never be developed.

Alternatives

- L-12/L-11 Absolutely not wanted at all it will pass through my family farm of 110 years.
- Please seriously review the suggested re-route for study on sheet map 2.
- On sheet map #2, in purple marker, "suggested reroute for study". Suggested re-route would cross far fewer landowners, would be avoiding population, would be crossing undeveloped land and land that has little potential to be developed (no water to support development) would simplify the route-fewer towers (corners).
- I very much dislike the route L10, L11, L12 that runs near Byers.
- I like the proposed route of L8 & L9.
- If lines do not affect health and are primarily an aesthetic issue, then why don't you move the corridor away from land on which the line would have an economic impact (development, agriculture).
- Farther east would be better for everyone as few people live there and there is very little water to sustain a population.
- L13, L21, L23 is in an area of high development potential vs. the proposed L15 route.
- The line to the east should be moved away from our homes. L22/M5 should be moved away from our homes. It should be moved farther east.
- I prefer it stays on the proposed route. L-15, L-9, L-17.
- Prefer that you not split irrigation circles in L9.
- T2S R61W Sec 14 and 23 prefer location on west side of 246 road- so don't interfere with irrigation pond.
- I am opposed to Segment L-10 and Segment L-11 which currently as the proposed alternative bisects my property diagonally.
- Prefer route L-2 avoids rough country of the breaks.
- Do not place on L10 & L11.
- Interested only in proposed route L8, L9.
- On route L9 in black marker is a shop, restaurant, house, motel.
- Please don't do this use the proposed rough [sic]. Dosnt [sic] go threw [sic] home's.
- L8 & L9 preferred over L-10, is threw my property. 71777 E Cr 10, Byers.
- Please consider L8 & L9 where there are no homes :).
- T 45 R60W Section 7 in purple marker.
- I live on the alternative route. If you do it will cut across my potential development land on section 12 & 13 on 112th and South. Hopefully you will be east of me.
- Would prefer it follows existing lines to not create a new corridor.

Alternatives

- Specifically K10 vs. k11.
- I am writing in regards to my property at 3005 Old Windmill View, Yoder, Colorado 80864.
- Why not go along a major highway where there is much easier access.
- Why is the power line going through the properties and not along roadways or where there is not any development yet.
- I am paying for 40 acres and you want to take this away from me when there are alternate routes that can be used.
- We have looked at the proposed route on the map. We are not clear as to why you did not choose to route the lines a bit to the south of this area where there is primarily undeveloped land.
- He provided his property coordinates (section 16, T9S, R36W) and from that information I was able to determine that an alternate route was located a half mile away from his property.
- Mr. Ridder called because he was unable to attend the public meetings and he wanted to verify that he was reading the map he had correctly, and that the route near his property was an alternate route as opposed to a proposed line.
- I would like my property to be used to generate electricity with the windmills. Or I would like to grow corn to be used for fuel.
- Please tell me more specifically where the alternative route goes.
- Again, your consideration to go across the above mentioned grassland would be so much appreciated. Thank you and sincerely, Max Engler.
- Your map also shows line B7 taking a 45 degree angle across cropland as it turns south. This grassland route would also prevent you from having to angle "line B7" across cropland just to the east of my cropland.
- At the Lakin meeting, one of your representatives, Larry drew on map 47 this alternative route across the grassland. You would be able to start at section 12-21-36 and follow a draw that angles across section 18, 17, 16, 15, and 22 all in townships 21, R35.
- All this land has grassland on it. Your consideration to use this grassland route rather than cropland would be very much appreciated.
- The map at the first meeting in September had the electric line go across this property. I am pleased to see you have moved the line 1/2 mile south of this field. Thank you, Max.
- Section 8 and 9-21-35, Kearny Co. Kansas is cropland I farm and electric line B7 is proposed to go across this land. I have other land your electric line will go over, however this is land that would cause me the most difficulty and there is an alternative route that should work better for both of us.
- There are several miles of grassland just to the south of this area that should be used for the electric line.

Alternatives

- As an owner of a residential building site in Evergreen Country Estates located in Section 36, T3S, R61W that the "L12" section of the line, even though it does not lie directly on my property, will be a great detriment to my building site investment for which I will be seeking full damage compensation and alternative routes.
- The main issue to be addressed is to keep this Transmission Line away from our land as far as possible.
- Please if you could keep the line to the South of us we would greatly appreciate it.
- Now this new info puts the line running east to west on the southern border of our section 18, what happened?
- What if any consideration has been made by TriState/Western to the design and routing of such transmission lines to accommodate the interconnection of renewable (primarily wind) energy projects along its path?
- Sheet map 31 3) As C5 heads south, it should begin 1/2 mile earlier than proposed but stay in west half of sec. 12 & 13 to stay away from irrigation on sec. 14 and house as it travels further south.
- Sheet map 31 4) We are strongly opposed to C6 & C4 as they cross by nice houses and our feedlot and many irrigated parcels. Please contact me if you have questions as to our comments.
- Sheet map 31 2) As C5 begins, line should remain on Sec. 10 & 11 to stay away from irrigation and dryland as much as possible.
- Sheet map 31 1) As C7 crosses I-70 south, line should remain on west half of sec. 4 as it is now CRP and not irrigation.
- I am ok with changing the wood pole system with the steel ones, but do not want an increase in voltage being passed along that line.
- I know that you have to worry about cost, but it would be great if you could put these lines underground, then I would not hear or see them.
- Adjacent to existing roads, along fence lines, other.
- Why wouldn't it be easier and better to run the A route parallel to the B route at least until it could turn directly west toward Lamar.
- As shown on the most recent printed map, the A1, A2, and A10 routes southwest of the Rolling Hills Substation should be avoided. This is an area that is critical to lesser prairie chickens.
- First... You have already caused confusion by now designating B routes as routes that were previously designated A routes. And vis-versa [sic].
- Would property on the proposed route be considered "on grid" enough to allow wind farm input into the grid?

Alternatives

- Alternate E4 in Kiowa County runs a mile north of the intersection of Cr33 and CrD. The half section (NE and SE) of section 17 within township 20S Range 49W is registered in CRP as this ground is considered highly erodible. It is native grass.
- The alternate route is too close to housing already established.
- I like the proposed route coming out of Brush substation (Beaver Creek) going south and east then proceeding south.
- Prefer C5 (proposed) to C6 because C6 is within 3/8 mile of my home, Burlington to Lamar.
- At least two of these houses lie directly in the path of the proposed route and two more are very near. The map on the next page shows where the houses are located.
- We urge you to look for a different route.
- Or how about following the existing corridor where the power line runs already?
- Surely there is a better route perhaps farther south? Have you considered the area between Meyers Road and Drennan Rd?
- She said that WAPA had sent her some information including aerial photos of the line route near her house. She said that she couldn't find her house on the photos. I asked her how far from the proposed line route her house is and she was not sure. She said she will step off the distance and let me know. She is planning to attend the public meeting in Hanover on Feb. 22nd.
- She is concerned that on of the two routes for the Midway to Big Sandy line will run quite close to her house. She is a practitioner in the healthcare field (details unknown) so she apparently has some understanding of human health effects.
- We are supportive of the proposed corridor that includes L3, L5, L8, and L9, because we feel that there are fewer environmental and natural resource constraints with this corridor, especially when it is compared to the alternative corridor (L4, L19, L12, and L14).
- However we are even more concerned with the Colorado Natural Heritage Program, "Potential Conservation Areas" that encompass both the proposed and alternative corridors.
- However we have some mixed feelings and concerns with the other proposed corridor in Eastern Arapahoe County. Our initial preference is for the L1 alternative corridor versus the L2 proposed corridor because it appears that there is more habitat area that may be disrupted than with the proposed corridor.
- I looked up his property coordinates on GIS (N 1/2 of section 30, T10S, R45W) and verified that the alternate route was actually a mile and a half north of his property. I also looked on Sheet Map 51 and confirmed that.
- I called him back to make sure he didn't have any questions and he expressed some concern that according to the sheet map he received, the proposed route was going through his property.

Alternatives

- I am the secured lender on property located near, or perhaps in, your project. The property is known as, and is in the name of, BAAB steel, and is located near Midway, Colorado, east of 1-25 and immediately east of and contiguous with of the US Truck Driving School.
- Mr. Edmundson called to discuss transmission line routes that cross the Bohart Ranch.
- Mr. Edmundson would like the project to stay along existing transmission line corridors and not establish a new transmission line corridor on the Bohart—and to especially avoid putting a line within sight of the particular hill he climbs.
- Mr. Bordner wasn't able to tell if the routes were in the vicinity [sic] of his property, based on the maps he received. I let him know that the proposed route in his area doesn't effect his land; however, the alternative may.
- Mr. Bradshaw asked if wind generation would be allowed to tie into this system, my reply was that the interconnect issues are dealt with by Tri-State, he asked if having a wind farm close to transmission lines was better or worse (better as far as construction costs).
- Mr. Bradshaw requested a more detailed map, as he is curious regarding the proximity of the route to his land. He asked if the B18-B20 segments were proposed sections.
- He had been told at a public meeting that the proposed route was attempting to not cross state land, and he wanted to see if there were any other options that would still avoid state land.
- He received Sheet map 11 in the mail. I determined that he was probably wanting Sheet map 12, 13, 14, 15, and 22 and stated that I would mail those to him.
- Route J5 where I'm located is mostly subdivided into forty acre parcels with a large number of homes, more are being built everyday.
- I feel another Route (other than J5) would be best being less populated.
- A suggested route east of L9 that is east of range 59 traveling north to south might be even better
- In any event, L12 and L14 would be bad.
- L9 and L15 would be much better.
- He was informed that the routes are not final, and that we try to follow roads or other utility corridors when we can, however in some instances like center pivots other routes are developed.
- You have a line running west of Last Chance which is your alternative route. I would think this would be much less invasive to surroundings than the proposed route.
- I would like to protest this route east of Last Chance.
- A neighbor told me your proposed power line will cross 4 sections of my land.
- He is concerned that the preferred route for the Rolling Hills to Burlington line will run next to his land.
- The route from Burlington to Lamar is the one that may impact us.
- I farm and ranch south of Burlington and prefer the proposed route over the alternates.

Alternatives

- Proposed routes N2 and J4 are agreeable. We are located just outside Limon in Elbert County No & So of Hwy 24.
- He has questions/issues near L12 North of Byers (Evergreen Country Estates) he states that there are a number of landowners in the area upset about L12. They would like to know when the next meetings will be.
- The J4 proposed line between Big Sandy and Midway goes over a corner of my land.
- However if the 200' easement would prevent this future tree planting, then I would like to see the line shifted slightly west or use the J3 alternate route instead of the J4 route.
- If my plans to place a tree shelter belt around section 20 are not impacted then I'm OK with the proposed J4 location.
- My question involves my future plans to place a tree shelter belt around the perimeter of my land- including section 20. Will this be affected if the J4 line goes over my land?
- Debbie Hammerlund called concerned about L24 and its location. I (Chris Mullaney) looked up her address in relation to L-24, returned her call and sent her sheet map 1 since it shows her house and L24.
- The Lamar line could branch off at the "B5" point on the Burlington line.
- I made this suggestion at the meeting in Lakin and was told to put the idea on this form and send it in. To reduce cost and various landowner ill-will, it would seem logical to use the one route going North of Holcomb to the Burlington Substation for both Lamar and Burlington.
- Mr. Holmes phoned in to leave a comment. He stated that he is for Western/Tri-State using his land for transmission lines and has no problem with the project.
- After viewing the aerial map at the Byers School meeting on Feb 16th, and the answers we received to our questions and for the most logical reasons we are strongly in favor of the proposed route, and for the same reasons, strongly opposed to the alternative routes.
- In regards to the proposed B1-B2 route the B1 route impacts our farming operation in Sec 14-24-34.
- JO cattle co. would be opposed to the B-1 route.
- The proposed and alternate routes could be moved a short distance to avoid residences. Continuing segment B3 straight north would appear to avoid numerous residences.
- Follow routes that avoid residences. Moving the lines 1 1/2 miles south or 3 miles north would avoid a large number of private residences.
- Avoid farmland where possible and route through pasture and non-tilled areas.
- Follow section lines rather than crossing in the middle of property.

Alternatives

- There is a residence in the NW 10-21-36 that serves a farm headquarters for Kuhlman Family Farms, LLC. This headquarters is complete with a 2,650 foot grass runway that is used for my personal aircraft. Construction of this transmission line across the South end of that runway would effectively eliminate my main access to my farm operation. Your use of the alternate route of B2, B3, B4, B9, B11, B14, B18, B20, B21 would remove this conflict.
- Try to avoid my ground.
- Your B6 option will affect me the most.
- Identification of alternative site for Boone substation just NE of proposed site in Sec. 4 T21S R61W. Map 15.
- Identification of 3 homesites, Sections 17, 20, and 21 T9S R43W, under alt. C6-C2. "Do not want these alts."—written by alt. C4. Map 31.
- He provided his property coordinates (Sec. 16 T9S R36W) and from that information I (K. Kampbell) was able to determine that an alternate route was located a 1/2 mile from his property.
- He would like the Transmission Line on his land. Please keep route B11 on his land vs. the alternative.
- Mrs. Salem stated that she couldn't tell if her land was going to be impacted by the proposed or alternative route. She asked for an aerial photo to be sent to her. Sec. SE 1/4 10, T21S, R39W.
- The plan for the line, just southeast of Limon affect a lot of state land. This line should run straight and not go diagonally.
- If possible, all lines should follow existing power line corridors.
- Power lines should follow section lines or half section lines and not cross diagonally unless it is following an existing powerline corridor.
- Can you go underground??
- Hopefully you will be able to go with the proposed A-7 route.
- Using alternative A-5 comes very close to the trail by Syracuse.
- Proposed line west of Morgan/Washington county line. Alternate too close to existing residential sites and buildings.
- I would much prefer the alternative route L23. It is a more direct route and would save several miles of unnecessary construction.
- Please consider using one of the alternate routes or at least moving the corridor to the north side of the current line.
- It does not seem practical in this context to channel all routes through the same corridors i.e.: Big Sandy –Midway.
- The importance of establishing a variety of options today cannot be over emphasized.

Alternatives

- The Big Sandy to Midway route as originally proposed seems to best address the many factors considered in this planning process. It also increases future options. Frankly it seems more logical than the alternative.
- Sheet map 31 1) As C7 crosses I-70 south, line should remain on west half of sec. 4 as it is now CRP and not irrigation.
- Sheet map 31 2) As C5 begins, line should remain on Sec. 10 & 11 to stay away from irrigation and dryland as much as possible.
- Sheet map 31 3) As C5 heads south, it should begin 1/2 mile earlier than proposed but stay in west half of Sections 12 & 13 to stay away from irrigation on Sec. 14 and house as it travels further south.
- Sheet map 31 4) We are strongly opposed to C6 & C4 as they cross by nice houses and our feedlot and many irrigated parcels. Please contact me if you have questions as to our comments.
- Can this not be routed through adjacent grazing land or Fort Carson land that is not inhabited?
- A7 36-21-37 Kearny Co. KS. This line is proposed to run on the 1/2 mile line. That means it will not parallel a county road or access road.
- B3 17-23-34. We have an irrigation well located in the SW corner of this section. If the line runs over the well it would be difficult to work on the line with power in there.
- The purpose of this letter is to firmly object to the newly developed alternative route for the EPTP which would adversely affect Owl Canyon Property as well as the surrounding vicinity.
- For the above stated reasons, it is my client's position that the construction of this proposed 500-kilovolt line in and upon the alternate route is unacceptable.
- While it is understood that any route for proposed new electrical transmission facilities will result in some level of objection, proposed route J4 is much more objectionable than available alternatives and should be discounted and disregarded as a route for this proposed transmission facility. A different route should be selected so that the objections voiced in this letter and by my clients are avoided. If you have any questions concerning the contents of this letter, do not hesitate to contact me.
- Proposed Route J4, as it runs from Limon south to a point approximately 13 miles south of Limon, then turns southwesterly, directly impacts at least ten (10) residences and one (1) bed and breakfast business.
- All of our clients uniformly and vehemently object to the J4 proposed route and respectfully request that the J4 proposed route be abandoned and that either one of the alternative routes be adopted or that a substitute route be identified and followed.
- The proposed J4 route crosses active wetlands at the point where it turns in a southwesterly direction. The adverse environmental impact on those wetlands can and should be avoided the selection of an alternate route.

Alternatives

- The proposed J4 route should be rejected because of its adverse impact on numerous residences and at least one business.
- Objection to proposed Route J4, Midway Substation to Big Sandy Substation Transmission Line.
- We strongly object to this proposed route and request that the J4 route be abandoned and an alternate route adopted.
- According to information furnished from your office, proposed route J4 would be within one-half mile west from our property and could be placed closer.
- I am a land owner in the area of the proposed J4 line. All of this land is farm ground and is actively being farmed. 480 acres of my farms will be adversely affected with towers and lines of the 500kV line.
- Alternative suggestions to proposed Route J4: Since Western must acquire easement/right of way for the 230kV line from Big Sandy substation to 125 mile substation (N1, N2, N3, or N4), could that also accommodate the 500 kV line that must go to Midway? That line then could proceed from 125 mile south and connect with J3/J5 to reach midway. Less easement acquisition, less farmland, more rangeland, sparsely settled.
- Alternative suggestions to proposed Route J4: If the above suggestion is not possible, then please reconsider alternative routes J1 or J3/J5. Those routes both cross less farmland and more rangeland that does J4, through sparsely settled areas. Lower acquisition costs, lower damage and loss of production claims.
- Related question: When a transmission line is proposed to follow an existing county road, as it is with J4 in that area of the Skinner holdings, how is the decision made as to which side of the road, and thus which landowner's holdings, will be used as the actual route?
- Objections to proposed Route J4 as shown on Sheet Map 9: As J4 crosses Townships 10S and 11S, R56W, it passes through or borders some 16 sections, nearly all of which is ACTIVE FARMLAND. It seems that selection of a route such as J1 that uses primarily range/pasture land would result in lower costs for acquisition of easements/rights of way (land values are lower) and less loss of agricultural productivity, since livestock grazing is more compatible with transmission lines than is farming.
- Objections to proposed Route J4 as shown on Sheet Map 9: Along the proposed Route J4 as it runs from Limon south to a point approximately 13 miles south of Limon, then turns southwesterly, crosses highway 71, and passes off of Sheet Map 9, it directly impacts at least 10 residences in terms of view and electrical interferences. That would not be as true of an alternative such as J1, since the pastureland is more sparsely settled.
- Objections to proposed Route J4 as shown on Sheet Map 9: J4 is now proposed for some 3 miles to pass along the borders of land owned and farmed by one family, Larry and Grace Skinner and Opal Skinner, and to pass within a quarter mile of the skinner residence located on Lincoln County Road 2W. That is a serious impact in terms of home and land value.

Alternatives

- It would be much better if the line could go underground.
- Township 11 south, range 56 west.
- Why not follow J3 routes which is a shorter distance for Western Power than the J4 route.
- Your alternate would encompass less farm ground.
- The other ways of running this line would be better for all concerned. Why no run it alongside an existing line?
- The line coming to the Big Sandy substation on the north side of Hwy 287 is good because it is in heavier soil and less erodible. The line leaving Limon should stay North of I-70 going west of Limon because that is also heavier soil and less erodible from wind.
- At the very least the line should parallel the existing Tri-State line a not chop up land with more easements.
- In T7S, R56W, segment L2 cuts across fields. L2 would be better adjacent to K1.
- The southern alternative for the Big Sandy- Burlington line in T10S, R52W would be better along the correction line about three miles south of the current alternative. A route there would have better access and be adjacent to an existing line.
- A representative from the City of Brush commented that the City of Brush will be happy if the proposed route continues to move to the east in the area around Brush.
- Segment G4 on Map 22 in T8S, R50W, Secs. 7, 8, & 18- Proposed route has been revised in this area. Prefer the original alignment. Currently uses Z road for takeoff and landing for crop spraying. Would be even better about one mile to the south.
- Glen Arp – K Road and Highway 71; questions about RI/TVI; prefers alternative to the east; asked question about literature sent out defining “corridor” as 3-miles wide.
- James Collie (Jamaco LP) – prefers alternative that follows existing line between Big Sandy and Burlington.
- James R. White – Consider route east on Fossinger Road and across state land; would be okay with line on west side of his property (Section 6 and 31 south of Sanborn Road).
- Ms. Schlagel (husband on Tri-State Board) – concern with dryland south of 152nd; irrigated on north side; prefers east and north of preferred Big Sandy to Green Valley route; could build – not that rough; prefers not to use segment L10; cuts diagonal through north ½ of section 25, T4SR65W.
- Carl Nicks- Q Road and Highway 71; has existing line on property (Beaver Creek-Erie; does not like the alternative route; prefers the proposed route.
- Charlie Smith – prefers eastern-most route alternative.
- Group – need meeting in Yoder/Calhan area with all landowners; should follow existing line; those people bought and built next to existing line (Section 25, T14SR62W; alternative on state land ¼ to ½ mile south would be okay).

Alternatives

- Mike Coan – prefers M4; not M3; concern with property value in Section 31 east of M3.
- Carl Kroh – Segment L9 modified.
- Dale Stull – property near Lamar, east of Fountain and north of Big Sandy; no specific comments (generally avoiding).
- Gilbert – cropland 14-15 miles north of Big Sandy; can line be moved to west field line (drawn on map).
- Greg Penny – prefers eastern-most alternative for Burlington to Energy Center.
- Dwight Rockwell – Contact Mobile Gas in Yuma regarding gas line in T1NR45W, Section 15; west side of road is grass; prefers H5 or easternmost alternative; Bittercreek Gas (?) T1SR44W.
- does not agree with project – it isn't needed – he has enough power; build generation on front range and leave him alone; concern about farming around structures for the rest of his life; no amount of money can pay for that; wife discussed option of putting line on north side of existing line between Big Sandy and Burlington because of CRP land and absentee owners (noted on map) -- husband doesn't like that either because he would still have to look at it and doesn't think project is needed. Lee and Carey talked to extensively.
- Bob Wilger – grazing land use converted to dry crops in T21SR43W, Section 2; alternative drawn on Sheet 36; requested that single steel poles be used; requested annual payments for easements.
- Max Engler – Prefers alternative to segments B5 and B7 through grass; drawn on Sheet 47.
- Delmas Beaman – T18SR43W, Section 25; reroutes drawn on Sheet 27 to avoid diagonal in cultivated field; shift to north; grain bins at corner and to west.
- Ron Buller – Prefers C2 or C3; NOT C4 as it cuts through the middle of his ½ section.
- Lance Whitey – prefers single pole in agricultural land; otherwise, opposes preferred alternative.
- Dean Wieser – T5SR44W, Section 6; Avoid pivot and corner that is cultivated on Burlington to Wray preferred alternative.
- Joe Klausner – T1SR61W, sections 10 and 15; move to south.
- Larry Miller – refers no diagonal between segments B5 and B7; alternative drawn on Sheet 47.
- Dale Johnson – T14SR40W, Section 32; not in favor of line cutting across pasture; prefers alternative on south and west (this still surrounds him on 3 sides with existing line on east); pasture has well and was previously irrigated – still has water rights and could re-install pivot; 2 pivots on ½ section to south; consider going on south side so he isn't surrounded (owner is Dwayne Frasier); also concern with CRP compliance (has 1/8 mile of cedar trees). Also owns land north of Holly near Energy Center (T21SR41W, Section 6 and S ½ Section 1, T21SR42W) – no problem with line crossing here.
- Stewart Stabel – concern with views of segment B4 from house; built million-dollar home; segment A6 okay.

Alternatives

- Dean Saffer – prefers alternative that follows existing line between Big Sandy and Burlington.
- Ralph Brent – T7SR53W, Section 17; has alternatives on two sides of his house; would like alternative moved to west (drawn on map); asked about electric fences (referred to Bob Pearson).
- Clifford Johnston – T19SR54W, Section 26; prefers location as proposed but either would be okay; Ruthette talked to about acquisition of easement.
- Monte Miller – move A7 to section line; A6 also cuts through ½ section (move north to CR 9).
- John and Justin Hardwick – Look at alternative further east on grassland; 1-mile south of 15 Road + north OR 2 ½ -mile to west of preferred alternative; drawn on Sheet 29.
- Doug Kysar – house located at Hwy. 25 and CR5; next to existing Xcel Energy 345kV line; prefers B8 – not B6 or he would be surrounded by lines; Ruthette will send 11x17 map of Sheet 47.
- Gregg Mullen – concerned about views from house to south; prefers eastern-most route alternative.
- Ryan Weaver (Group) – move preferred alternative from Burlington to Energy Center ½ mile west south of K Road; Paconic Road is main road for planting and harvest; most activity in July and September; grain bins discussed; also close to house on east side of 55 Road (Roger Cleavanaugh ?).
- Jim Rowton – T17SR37W, Section 1; reroute between B10 and B12 drawn on sheet 42; owner is Whitam Land & Cattle.
- Section 36 along segment M3. It is probably OK to split the state land. Concerned about the visual impacts from properties to the east.
- Curtis Bandt: T14S R60W 31, 32. I would like you to NOT divide the sections in half with this line.
- Follow N2, N3, N4 to 125-mile sub, then go south to J5 or J4.
- Glenn Benjamin: I would like the line to run along N4—this is more on grassland and less on farmland.
- Glenn Benjamin: As a last resort, route the line along the extreme east edge of the section line to minimize impacts of running right down the middle of my property.
- Would like the line to located at least 60 feet in from the road so we can more easily maintain the area between the section line/road and the structures. Easier to control weeds. Equipment is 40-60 feet wide and we want to be able to maneuver completely around the structures.
- I prefer K-10 route over K-11. My house is less than ¼ mile from the route on K-11. Also, my parents have a house within about 1 mile south of where k-11 turns to the east.
- Matt Witt: T8s R51W I prefer G4 over G3.
- Hugh Scherrer: J1 is on a lot of grass, which would be better. Let me know if J3 becomes the proposed.

Alternatives

- I prefer the A1 route.
- T1S R45W Section 24. Which side of the road will the line be on? NE1/4 is farmland, NW1/4 is grass.
- I prefer the L17 routed.
- Karen Schminke, Asst. City manager, Brush, CO: Prefer the eastern corridor (K10), because it minimizes impacts to Brush.
- I prefer this route (K 10).
- Do not run down middle of section through irrigated farmland, stay in grassland/range land whenever possible. T24S R34W 13 and 14.
- After reviewing these two routes, they appear to avoid or run parallel to much of this property, alleviating some of our concern.
- Attached is a map showing the proposed "southern" routes in relation to the property that Sunflower is proposing to restore to sandsage shrubland.
- Mr. Garrett Mitchek has requested Western keep our line 1/2 mile from his house. Attached is a map showing the line, his house, and his property. He is happy to cooperate with us provided we can accommodate his request.
- Why do we see the need to go diagonally across her property.
- Why are we going along the southern edge of her property?
- Originally talked with Chris Mullaney- they do not want the route to diagonally cut through the SW quarter, They want it to follow the road.
- We will be affected by this powerline no matter which route it takes. However, we would rather deal with the towers through the fields and the compaction problems that will go with it- in the fields, rather than in the native grass (where compaction will mean erosion.)
- Your alternate route <J3 & J5> would also encompass less farm ground.
- We talked to Jim Hartman at the Limon meeting. Our concern is where your line crosses sections 31 & 32 in El Paso county. The line will cut through the middle of these two sections and that is unacceptable [sic] to us.
- Jim didn't think there would be a problem moving the line a half mile north to the section line. That would be acceptable [sic] to us.
- These comments are in reference to the proposed 125 mile substation. The proposed route goes north across Hwy 86 and splits section 11 in half. This concerns me a great deal.
- Please consider putting the 230kV line on the section line between section 11 and section 12. This would not have any effect [sic] on the overall direction of the line, it would move the line away from the homesite in Sec. 11 and any new land wouldn't have a transmission line going right across it.

Alternatives

- Mr. Brantley provided some preliminary alternative routes that he feels would reduce the overall impact of the route to homes, in general.
- Another suggestion is to continue J4 SE to run east of the State Land and hook up with the I1 alternative to head into Midway; There may be an opportunity to minimize impacts to residences by following J6 and parts of J7, then heading east to go north of Yoder, the turning south before getting to Rush and getting back to J5, or perhaps continuing east to the south of Rush and heading east to hit J4.
- Jim Hartman and Mr. Brantley met in Aurora to discuss the proposed routing of J4 as it nears the State Land in T14S R61W. Mr. Brantley and other homeowners in the area are forming a Committee to help identify options to the proposed route J4 and its location in proximity to houses and subdivided areas surround the State land. Mr. Brantley mentioned State Representative Looper in conjunction with the committee, but I was unclear as the Representative Looper's potential role.
- Routing options that Mr. Brantley thought the Project would find agreeable are attached to this summary of comments.
- There is plenty of open space-- grazing land to the east which would be more appropriate for the t-line routing.
- The F line from Lamar to Limon would make the least impact on the farm land as most of this route is on pasture land, the G4 line will impact my farmland. I have a powerline across my land now and it is a terrible inconvenience to try to farm around the pole and brace structure.
- I have gained access to a map #21 the G4 line between Road 39 and Road 42. This is unacceptable on the east side of Road 39.
- The "F" line is still the most direct route from Lamar to Limon.
- You cross over the present line on Section 3 into my farm ground and angle across Section 4-8-53 farm ground. Stay on the south side of the existing line.
- The F8 alternate line south of the Big Sandy Creek is a very sandy and unstable route and if you were to use this route, I don't think you could ever control the erosion and wind damage you would create going across this land. I strongly suggest that you stay with the proposed F7 route due to the more stabile [sic] ground conditions.
- I strongly support the F7 proposed route.
- Proposed route much shorter and better for environment.
- Proposed Route N2: Big Sandy to 125-Mile: This 230 kV line would cross River Bend Ranch from east to west, starting at T8S/ R57W/ S30, and running west/southwest for five miles through T8S/ R58W/ S28. we accept the routing of this proposed route, as it avoids any conflict with our ranch operations and follows a direct line with minimal visual impact.

Alternatives

- We're primarily concerned with ultimately having three separate power lines cross the F Cross Ranch. This would seem to exceed one family's share of the area's load. To avoid this scenario, we would especially ask that Alternate Route L1 be eliminated from consideration.
- If proposed route K9 is chosen then we would request a change in its route. Specifically we would suggest that it make its turn at T4S/ R55W/ S35 (three miles to the north of where proposed). This would allow both lines to cross the public road at the same place, reducing its visual impact, and in addition would avoid some of the rougher terrain encountered in Township 5S. There would also not be homes, farmsteads or driveways along a more northern route.
- Alternate route K11 would also be more consistent with your stated desires of building along the shortest linear route, and following existing power lines.
- Proposed Route K9: Big Sandy to Beaver Creek: This 345 kV line would follow the existing 230 kV Tri-State line north of Limon and cross our south property line before turning northeast to run diagonally across five sections of the F Cross Ranch (see enclosed map). We support Alternate Route K11 which would cross our property parallel to an existing power line.
- Suggested running the route north and south along the western edge of the state land then south down to the township line, then turn west to hit up with the route near Hwy 71.
- Requested that the line go directly North and South and East and West along section lines, not diagonally across the land. Diagonal crossing will interfere with his ability to use the land.
- Before attending the meeting in Lakin, Feb 19th I received a map with proposed route on the county line- Hamilton/Greeley...at the meeting we were showed a map and it had changed to go across 10-20-40, we suggested to not take a 100 ft on each landowner.
- Again, I do not want any towers on NW 1/4 3-21-40/ NE 1/4 3-21-40/ NE 1/4 4-21-40 NE 1/4 10-21-40.
- As far as I know the actual physical location of the school is south of the proposed routes.
- Based upon our review of the most recent map depicting proposed and alternatives routes, it appears that all of the alternatives presently under consideration would cross Frost Livestock lands. The EIS must consider at least one alternative route for the Boone to Midway segment that does not cross the Frost Livestock Ranch.
- In addition, the EIS should consider reasonable alternatives to overhead powerlines, such as the alternative of underground transmission lines.
- Finally, wherever possible, any new power lines should be located within existing utility easements adjacent to existing power lines to mitigate impacts to previously undisturbed lands.
- She is concerned with that size of a facility on her property because it will significantly impact her farming operation. She prefers that the facility not be on her property but that M3 or M5 be selected. She will send in comments as well.

Alternatives

- Section 27 is the location of the proposed EPTP alternate power line route and switching station site (identified as M4). For the following reasons, you should choose M3 as the preferred route: 3. The alternate route on section 27 does not make good economic sense. The alternate route comes from the south, then doglegs one-half mile to the west, and then turns north again, right through the middle of section 27. This dogleg is purported to be due to a non-residential structure (small tank) on section 26. Yet, this dogleg runs adjacent to a tank, pump house and pit, not to mention an active oil well on the SE corner of section 27. Every turn increases the number of power poles on the property and increases EPTP costs dramatically. If the M4 alternate route is in fact selected, it would make more sense, economically, to minimize the length of the east-west dogleg (staying as close to the eastern property line as possible.) Not only would EPTP save the cost of wire for this 1/2 mile segment, it would reduce the impact on our farming operations.
- Section 27 is the location of the proposed EPTP alternate power line route and switching station site (identified as M4). For the following reasons, you should choose M3 as the preferred route: 1. The alternate route (M4) runs right through the middle of active producing farm land that supports the livelihood of four families. The alternate proposed M4 switching station (as I was informed by your engineers) would consume 5-10 acres of land in the center of this producing farms, taking it out of production permanently. This does not take into account access roads required to maintain the facility. This reduction in producing farm land would cause unreasonable hardship.
- I think you would find much less opposition to your projects if you weren't putting in the biggest lines money can buy/ or bury them underground.
- In regards to the J4 powerline: why not follow the J3 route which is a much shorter distance for you.
- I have a fence line in my pasture that I would consider using as an alternate route for this area.
- Alternative Route B13 crosses an old Native American campground with artifacts and fire pits on Section 12-10S-40W.
- I have maps that indicated the lines will be down Sanborn Rd., to the North of Sanborn Rd, and South of Sanborn Rd. So I'm not sure where the lines will be installed.
- The transmission line J4 runs parallel with Sanborn Rd approximately 1/2 to 3/4 of a mile south of Sanborn Rd. Just before it intersects with the J8 transmission Line it makes a northward jog on to or near Sanborn Rd and continues to travel west. This jog appears to travel across the southwest corner of our property. I am concerned about this due to the fact that it encroaches on to our property but will also cut across numerous homes on the North side of Sanborn Rd.
- If you have time to look at the Eastern Plains Transmission Project map where the lines jog on Sanborn Rd before Baggett Rd this is the area of concern. I don't know why the lines have to be placed on the North side of Sanborn and can't be placed south of Sanborn Rd on the Bohart Ranch.
- The F8 route will require more towers be installed (south and west of Hugo) due to the topography of the ground which has severe elevation changes through the sand hills. The F7 route has much leveler topography (north and east of Hugo) which should require less towers.

Alternatives

- The ground along the F7 corridor around the Hugo Co vicinity is much more stable ground than along the F8 corridor. It will be much easier and accessible to run the line on the F7 corridor rather than the F8 corridor. The ground will be easier to reclaim the ground and easier to maintain an easement along the F7 corridor, rather than the F8 route.
- Are there possibly other routes that may be used to avoid the proposed route through my property?
- The proposed route is OK for, one of the alternative routes that runs the line just east of Byers goes through not only a development of ours but also several 40 acre lots with existing houses.
- As noted on page one, (sec. 36, 35, 61W) is a platted development with several sites sold and built on. The alternative route goes through this property, as well as existing development. The route should stay as proposed crossing Highway 36 (going North and south) approximately 10 miles east of Byers.
- The route should stay about 10 miles east of Byers, CO as it runs N & S to avoid a higher population density.
- To whom it may concern, my name is Lori Meek and I am in the corridor of the Eastern Plains Transmission Project. My neighbors and myself have been trying very hard to come up with alternate routes, many were not even aware of the project.
- But, if you would try to avoid me by slightly more distance, given I live away from even the smallest of power lines on three sides of my property, and have underground lines on the property... and also live with minimal voltage, this would be so helpful and I would be grateful.
- Thank you for your consideration... and I know I am only asking because I absolutely have to do so. Perhaps the alternative route or a route nearer/ north of US 94—would work for you—and also make it survivable for me.
- Would you be willing to try to work with me, to "go around" me by a few more miles, to make it possible for me to continue to survive and make progress? I know you must do something... I honestly understand that. I know, too, that many will fight you with "both barrels" for a variety of reasons, but I do not want to cause trouble.
- Would you try to work with me, to go around me by a few more miles to make it possible for me to survive and continue to progress? I know you must do SOMETHING... but if you would try to avoid me by slightly more distance (given I live away from even small power lines) this would be a great help to me. I live with minimal voltage, no electromagnetic devices/appliances... (sic) to health complications from these incidents already.
- We would much prefer the route would be 1 1/2 mile east of home, where there are other transmission lines located (L1, map 7) It would then branch off northwest 1 mile south of the Lincoln Washington County Line (Line 1 map 6) Hoping you will take into consideration this opinion.
- Follow existing lines, especially north of Big Sandy (K1, L1).

Alternatives

- Based on current proposed routes, a large portion of our farm is crossed at a diagonal (45 degrees). Would it be possible to route the lines along Range & township boundaries and create one 90-degree turn instead of two 45 degree turns?
- Please look at another route, north of Hwy 94. Please put it in open pasture where it won't impact our children's and family's health.
- That's why I endorse the option of the alternative line J5 and not proposed line J4 & also my proposal of the usage of the existing 345kV transmission line north of Highway 94 even if have to extend the right of way wider.
- Proposed line J4 impacts many more miles to reach Limon impacts me in a special way which I will elaborate on in the next section. If J4 must be used I think 1 mile North of Highway 94 would be most efficient along the existing 345kV transmission line.
- Because there is already a transmission line going through there, I want to see the alternative route J5 used.
- I ask you to use the alternative route or other suggestions I have provided north of Highway 94 where a transmission line already exists, or whatever is necessary to avoid her by a few more miles. Thank you, Robert Paul.
- Please be advised that I would find Transmission Lines crossing my property as unacceptable. I am still not sure if the line proposed is the proposed or proposed alternative line.
- I strongly suggest the F7 route which has much more stable ground.
- The F7 route would be a lot better soil to hold instead of the 7 8 alternatives which is very sandy soil with large blowouts. The erosion problem is very difficult now without disturbing if further.
- I strongly support the F7 route.
- Regarding sections 23 & 24 of T15S, R63W of the 6th PM in El Paso County, Colorado. The proposed route for the transmission project is acceptable. However, the alternative route could be detrimental to the sale or development of this property. Both of these sections of land are currently on the market and all facts of the transmission project are being disclosed to potential buyers.
- We would like to suggest that the new transmission line either follow the existing power line or even better, that the transmission line would follow the section lines on the south boundary of this property, as was discussed at the March 1st meeting at Hanover High School. Your consideration of this request would be greatly appreciated.
- As long as either the proposed or alternative routes are followed exactly, I have no concerns. However if the alternative route is chosen and you have to change it, I may have concerns at that time.
- Please consider any alternative for this line that goes west, rather than south of Limon across pasture rather than farmland, and that impacts fewer residences. You will have to cross Interstate 70 and the Big Sandy Creek either way, so that is not a factor.

Alternatives

- Along the proposed Route J4 as it runs from Limon south to a point approximately 13 miles south of Limon, then turns southwesterly, crosses highway 71, and passes off of Sheet Map 9, it directly impacts at least 10 residences in terms of view and electrical interferences. That would not be as true of an alternative such as J1, since the pastureland is more sparsely settled.
- Alternative suggestions to proposed route J4: Since Western must acquire easement/right of way for the 230 kV line from Big Sandy substation to 125 mile substation (N1 and N2, or N3, or N4) could that also accommodate the 500kV line that must go to Midway? That line then could proceed from 125 mile south and connect with J3/J5 to reach Midway. Less easement acquisition, less farmland, more rangeland, sparsely settled.
- As J4 crosses Townships 10S and 11S, R56W it passes through or borders some 16 sections, nearly all of which is ACTIVE FARMLAND. It seems that selection of a route such as J1 that uses primarily range, pasture land would result in lower costs for acquisition of easements/ rights of way (land values are lower) and less loss of agricultural productivity, since livestock grazing is more compatible with transmission lines than is farming.
- Objections to proposed Route J4 as shown on Sheet Map 9: I own farmland adjacent to the proposed route J4 south of Limon. I had considered some limited residential development on that land, but the presence of a huge power transmission line and towers just to the west will substantially devalue that land.
- If the above suggestion is not possible, then please reconsider alternative routes J1 or J3/J5. Those routes both cross less farmland and more rangeland than does j4, through sparsely settled areas. Lower acquisition costs, lower damage and loss of production claims.
- Safety concerns at the Limon Airport: Limon's airport landing strip runs north and south. The prevailing winds are from the North. This means planes must approach the airport from the south. Proposed routes J2 & J3 (Midway to Big Sandy) would cross the flight path for an approach from the south. Therefore route J1 would be the preferred route for the Midway to Big Sandy powerline.
- Safety concerns at the Limon Airport: On the energy center to Big Sandy route proposed routes F8 and F9 and F11 would tend to encroach into flights from the south. Therefore, route F-10 which approaches the Big Sandy substation from the east would be the preferred route.
- Visibility concerns: On the midway to Big Sandy route, proposed route J1 is the preferred route because it would not block views to the east from the Town of Limon or our house. For the Energy center to Big Sandy routes, proposed route F10 would be preferred because it would have the least visual impact from the Town of Limon and our house.
- Because of these concerns, I am opposed to any route that would bring the transmission line within 500 feet of my property.
- What are the exact proposed or proposed alternative routes in the vicinity of my land? I am unable to determine this from the map that was mailed to me.
- The proposed transmission project conflicts with the above defined program goals. This being the case, NRCS in Kansas suggest you consider an alternative route.

Alternatives

- Mr. Thurlow phoned because he was concerned that the transmission line may affect conservation easements they have in Colorado and Western Kansas. He provided the legal description of one of the properties in question (Section 23, T11S, R41W) and asked that I email him an aerial map of that section so that he could better determine if the line may affect their easement. He also asked about shape file and I told him I would have to look into if we have any that we could send out. He said that the aerial map should be sufficient.
- The routes should be either 1/2 mile north of Highway 94 or 1/2 mile south of 94. This would make more sense [sic] and impact less homes. This would also shorten the route some. Enclosed is a map with the area circled.
- Through eastern & southern routes in open country- through large open ranch ranges- and state land if needed.
- Jim Hartman- I do so appreciate your meeting with me. As I told you we are going to fight this with all. We can acquire- info- media- (sic)- local and federal legislations. Neighbors are helping. Flyers, website, we are researching to educate (for both sides) I know the electricity is needed just feel that (knowing of the more open areas. I can be routed through far away from homes.
- Human lives are worth the extra costs. At any cost- to find alternatives and use them!
- L2 should be parallel & next to the existing line (L1 & K1. Both of them need to be west of the existing line to).
- K11 is a much better alternative because it won't go through as much farmground. K9 & K10 cuts through the middle of a large amount of farmground. It is a bad choice.
- K1 should stay on the west side of the existing line where the map shows that it becomes K5 and then K11.
- G3 impacts a large amount of farmland G4 would be better than G3, but G5 is by far the best option of these three because it would be mostly on grassland.
- When considering all routes, every effort should be made to preserve existing farmground. Following section lines would definitely be the best routes to choose.
- Impact less farmground. When these lines get to the county line between Lincoln & Washington counties it would be best for them to follow L1 to the west until it become L3.
- This route would impact less farmland than the proposed L2. The proposed L2 is the worst possible route the way it cuts through so much farmground.
- The proposed placement of the "Lamar North" line on road SS on the South side of the present power line will allow the continual limited use of our spray strips (T/O & edge) as marked on your meeting maps it will maintain Road SS as our emergency landing strip. The "lamar south" line north of road RR seems appropriate as it will not impact our proposed landing strip one mile south of the E-W line and that road does not have as much of a blowing closed concern.
- These concerns also deal with the "Boone" 500 kV line.

Alternatives

- My questions and concerns deal with: 1. location and placement of lines, 2. type of construction of towers, 3. effect on and consideration of operations and tenants.
- I would also suggest the "Big Sandy" 500kV line be located on the south side of the E-W county line road as this northern area has more wind and resultant road closures due to accumulating winds and snow from the North.
- Hope you use the planned route (sic) the 2nd choice on route near Hugo as much of this land is very sandy & blows easily. Also near my home.
- Alt. Route J4 would be the most likely to involve my property.
- In our opinion the alternative route would be better.
- Prefer the poles be mono-poles and located on the south side of the roads to minimize impact on terrace.
- We urge you to look for a more suitable route. The area several miles south of us would impact fewer people than this proposed route just south of Sanborn Rd.
- Why can't you just use the line going to north Greeley Co, KS to go west to the substation in Colorado?
- In my opinion the route should follow the "proposed" route. This way no further destruction of property value is involved. My main concerns rest on the value of my property.
- Mr. Russell MacLennan of Valhalla Ranches (section 32, T2S, R60W) is suggesting we route a portion of the Big Sandy- Green Valley transmission line along the section line instead of the 1/2 section line. Please see attached map.
- Mr. Howard is concerned because the SW corner of his property abuts the NE corner of the Bohart Ranch. The jog in the route would move the line much closer to his property. He much prefers the more northern alternative in the area.
- I told Mr. Howard that we had received a number of alternative suggestions from Mr. Brantley and that he might want to work with Mr. Brantley to make sure his concerns were reflected in that work.
- I did speak with Mr. Howard again on 3/14 and explained the jog in J4 at that point was to avoid crossing the state stewardship lands. As currently drawn, the route skirted the state land to join with the existing right of way and then cross the state land parallel to that right of way, based on state's requirements.
- I spoke with Mr. Howard on 3/13 and found he was concerned about J4 as it enters the Bohart Ranch. He wanted an explanation for why the proposed route jogged to the north and then back to the west in that area, only to eventually cross state land anyhow. At the time, I didn't have a good map to show the area of his concern. I offered to find the answer and call him back on 3/14.
- We want single poles vs. towers that are projected because: farming easier around pole vs. tower, not as much waste and land needed for production to feed our county, weed control will be eliminated by you under a tower.

Alternatives

- Route G5 would seem to me to be the better route than either G3 or G4. It would impact a lot fewer people and it would be cheaper.
- I don't feel that we on the eastern plains need the extra power. It seems that most of the power will be going to the front range and western slope, so it would make more sense to me to build the plant closer to the coal and to the demand for the electricity than to build lines and transport the coal, possibly southwestern Wyoming.
- Burlington to Big Sandy: G3 a terrible option because of the farmland impacts, G4 better option than G3 but not as good as G5, G5 best option because most of it is on grassland.
- Big Sandy to Green Valley: L2 needs to be located next to and parallel to K1 with both being on the west side of the existing line from Big Sandy to Beaver Creek until it almost (sic) the Washington-Lincoln county line and then follow L1 to the west until it become L3, This option avoids the Western Union tower located in sec 2 6S 56W, Less farmland would be impacted with this route rather than the proposed L2 route.
- Big Sandy to Beaver Creek: K1 needs to stay on west side of existing line all of the way to Beaver Creek, the K9 and K10 jog back to the east side of Highway 71 would affect too much farmland, K11 a lot better option than K9 & K10.
- I have marked several alternatives on the same map. I am sure that you can see what I am trying to show.
- I am hoping that these suggested routes that I am sending are of some help. You and your staff can alter and/or fine tune them to maybe come up with an alternative that we can all, or mostly all live with. Do not hesitate to contact me with ANY questions.
- Just sending some more variations of ways around- you and your team can (if you would) look at all I have sent & hopefully you will see something in all this that could work.
- At any rate, the to NE end across from the Post Office is Mr. Thiemans lease ground. Approx 1/3 of the area above the "drop zone" A good place to cross.
- I was not sure if you could "share" existing routes at the one mile point that runs east west above Highway 94. Yet, I see that your proposed and alternate routes show you doing just that. It that be the case.
- The idea of following Highway 71 south out of Limon is a corridor that would have less impact on rural development and families.
- This also crosses an area you and I discussed that is larger ranches and less concentration of homes. They also are mostly 'homesteaded' ranches. And possibly less likely to sub-divide. Yet it does allow for separate routing of circuits as you indicated you prefer. This is one area I see worth while to investigate. Yet I do not have the mapping that you do. So I will ask you to look into this area and see if it can not be made to work.
- All of that area above Ordway is large open section of grass on very large ranches. Hardly a house near the highway. Especially on the eastern side.

Alternatives

- The second suggested route. Following down J4 from Limon and then across to the Mid-way station. Would also have the same benefits. Although it would entail it going across approximately just 2 miles of state land. Along, above, or below Myers road out of the Edison area.
- The rest of the maps I am submitting to you are variations on the idea of going up off of the existing route going north off of the state land and across above and below highway 94 then on over to the J4 route out of Limon.
- I prefer you stay away from the alternative J3 route. We already have one line.
- The Beaver Creek- Hoyt line needs removed sooner than later.
- Unocal gas storage site proposal. County road P near Brush.
- Will run gas line south K12 (on section line, drawn on map #3) to 36" pipeline.
- Unocal gas storage project (S17, T3N, R55W) drawn on map #3.
- T25S R36W Sec23, 25, 36. Route A2. Homes (3) near route. Possibility of moving if not other way. (3 of them) + elec, sewer, etc.
- To interference now w/ small distribution line. What would this proposal do?
- There is already one major power line in front of the residence. We do not need to be sandwiched between two major powerlines.
- Also, the house on the property is already faced on the east by a major powerline immediately across the road, 75 feet away. I do not like the idea of having the house "sandwiched" between two major power lines.
- I'm on the committee for ports to plains Rt. From Hwy 71 to Brush. Please consider this in your planning of EPTP.
- Suber Slab- Falcon Parkway (3 miles ROW) Near Green Valley Substation- Ports to plains project.
- L-14 and L-12 are BAD. There is too much development in this area.
- My land is one of the few pieces of property to still be in the hands of the family that homesteaded it. We have had to see land around us developed into houses to ruin Gods creation don't force a powerline over it too.
- There is no reason to have a box on 3 sides around a set of homes.
- Our house is surrounded on 3 sides by your towers. There must be another way without destroying the 8 homes that are in this subdivision.
- It is bad enough to have power lines on 1 or 2 sides without having us surrounded on 3 sides.
- Would prefer it follows existing lines to not create a new corridor.
- Concerned that once a new corridor is created other lines will built there too.
- How will this project impact the proposed private toll road that may go therw [sic] this area?

Alternatives

- Three years ago a large electric line went across several of my fields. Compensation to go over the above mentioned cropland would need to be much higher as compared to what I received for the electric line 3 years ago.

Cumulative

- Our property already has an existing 230 KV line running through it. With your proposal, are you going to construct another tower or use the existing one?
- We also have an existing well drilled.
- Another transmission line on our property is going to limit what we can do and greatly reduce the value and the potential money we can receive for developing this land for maximum profit.
- We already have a 230 kV Xcel Energy Transmission line running for 2 miles right down the center of our property which has been very difficult to deal with over the years so WE DON'T NEED or WANT another transmission line on our property.
- I live at 10835 Grassland Rd, Colorado Springs, CO 80925. You have two tracks of towers, one steel and one wood, running through my subdivision. I have two concerns.
- Is there a concern about existing wells or the ability to place more well near the lines?
- I am already living 1/8 mile from a 345kV line.
- Since I already have Xcel's 345kV line on 8 quarters of ground, I don't need your B6 on 6 more quarters. You need to pass it around.
- Would like a detail of the existing transmission line easement AND its likely relationship with the easement of the 500 kV line.
- I believe there is a 230 kV line that the 500 would parallel- May be Tri-State's big sandy to Midway.
- Mr. Williams phoned in because he is in charge of a correctional facility that will be expanding and he was uncertain as to how the proposed line may affect their expansion. I informed him that if he could provide his property coordinates that we could send him an aerial map that would better show just how close the proposed route is to the property.
- We also felt it would be unfair to landowners and farmers to put another line alongside the existing line.
- It does not seem practical in this context to channel all routes through the same corridors i.e.: Big Sandy –Midway.
- This property already has a transmission line on the east side of the section.
- In addition to the above described transmission lines, there is third electric transmission line located in and upon Owl Canyon Property which carries 125-kilovolts.

Cumulative

- As you may know, such alternate route would place the proposed EPTP electric transmission line in the same corridor as the proposed 345-kilovolt electric transmission line to be built by the Public Service Company of Colorado.
- This new 345-kilovolt electric transmission line is to be in addition to the present 230-kilovolt line presently located in such corridor crossing Owl Canyon Property.
- Accordingly, in and upon Owl Canyon Property there is scheduled to be approximately 700 total kilovolts of power.
- As your proposed alternative route would also cross Owl Canyon Property in close proximity of the other transmission lines, and considering the EPTP line will carry 500KV of power, the total power in an upon Owl Canyon will be a terrifying 1200 kilovolts amassed in one small area.
- At the very least the line should parallel the existing Tri-State line a not chop up land with more easements.
- Colorado Background: The November election in 2004 passed the Regional Transportation District (RTD) 119 mile Rail Program (FasTracks) and former RTD Board Member and State Representative Bob Briggs met with RTD's Executive Director, Cal Marsella and it was decided to form a Colorado non-profit corporation called Front Range Commuter Rail (FRCR) to champion the designation of the Rocky Mountain Corridor as the 11th HSRC. In 2005, Colorado voters approved Referendum C, which made available for the first time about \$22 million dollars to support Transit projects. CDOT approved on September 20, 2006 a \$1.246 million dollar Feasibility Study Grant that FRCR had applied for to complete the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) requirement for a study in order to get the designation.
- United States Background: 11th High Speed Rail Corridor (HSRC)- The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991 originally called for the designation of 11 corridors, though only 10 corridors have been designated at this time. Thus, there remains one corridor to be designated. The designation has to be a part of a federal appropriations bill. The deadline for automatic designation was December 31, 2001. The state of Colorado, acting through CDOT, submitted an application for this eleventh corridor, with a connection to DIA, as well as the Mountain I-70 corridor from Denver to Eagle. Knowing that the deadline has passed, CDOT submitted the application as a placeholder in the event that high speed rail capital funding materialized. The three state effort to designate the Albuquerque, Denver, and Cheyenne corridor would thus supplant the 2002 CDOT application.
- Steps needed to complete the study: CDOT has required that a local government receive the grant. The decision has been made to form through the Intergovernmental Establishing Contract (IEC) the Rocky Mountain Rail Authority (RMRA) to receive the monies and complete the study.
- CDOT has required that a 20% local match or \$311,000 be raised to meet the local match requirement. The RMRA establishing contract has to be approved by 2 local governments. The Clear Creek County and the Town of Monument have signed the IEC. They have invited every local government affected by the project to join the RMRA. Every government that passes and signs the IEC addendum will have representation on the RMRA Board of Directors.

Cumulative

- The RMRA Board of Directors will: 1) set the budget to raise monies for the local match and the administration of the study, 2) approve the Request for Proposal for the Feasibility Study and 3) accept the recommendations from the study as to routes, schedules, rail technology, projects needed to create capacity on existing rail tracks, budget to build the system and construction time line.
- Rocky Mountain Rail Authority Contract Information: Bob Briggs, 5729 W. 115th Avenue, Westminster, CO 80020. Phone 303-427-8132, Email Bob.briggs@rangerxpress.com, web www.rangerxpress.com.
- Next Steps: The goal is have a statewide election in 2008 to ask the voters to build the rail infrastructure by approving a taxing source and creating a statewide authority to operate the system.
- I want to know where this project is in relationship to our property We are already under extreme duress from the proposed Super Slab toll road project and I am extremely upset about the possible attack on our property rights.
- Concern about the proliferation of transmission lines when a new corridor is established.
- The super slab corridor runs to the east of line segment M2.
- Vernon Scheem – has numerous easements on property; 3 gas, 1 oil, 1 transmission, 1 water line.
- Does not agree with project – it isn't needed – he has enough power; build generation on front range and leave him alone; concern about farming around structures for the rest of his life; no amount of money can pay for that; wife discussed option of putting line on north side of existing line between Big Sandy and Burlington because of CRP land and absentee owners (noted on map) -- husband doesn't like that either because he would still have to look at it and doesn't think project is needed. Lee and Carey talked to extensively.
- Dwight Rockwell – Contact Mobile Gas in Yuma regarding gas line in T1NR45W, Section 15; west side of road is grass; prefers H5 or easternmost alternative; Bittercreek Gas (?) T1SR44W.
- Doug Kysar – house located at Hwy. 25 and CR5; next to existing Xcel Energy 345kV line; prefers B8 – not B6 or he would be surrounded by lines; Ruthette will send 11x17 map of Sheet 47.
- Clede Widener – concern with getting equipment between (wheat drills are 60 feet wide) in area between existing Xcel line and new line; prefers to have 140-145' between H-frame lines (Energy Center to Lamar).
- Carl Nicks- Q Road and Highway 71; has existing line on property (Beaver Creek-Erie; does not like the alternative route; prefers the proposed route.
- Hugh Scherrer: T11S R58 W Sec 16 The old line crosses at a diagonal across property. Farming operations are difficult. The new line will make it many times worse to farm.
- Hugh Scherrer: I have already done my part by having the existing line on my property. I do not want another one.

Cumulative

- Unocal development will be located somewhere in your project area. Gas Development.
- When you have two adjacent lines it is very difficult to farm around them.
- Attached is a map showing the proposed "southern" routes in relation to the property that Sunflower is proposing to restore to sandsage shrubland.
- Mountain View came in to replace an underground line across my pasture and fields following the big line. They surveyed and staked 2 miles and did not contact me. I went to farm and here were all of those stakes in the field that were in the path of my irrigation sprinkler. TOTALLY UNACPETABLE [sic].
- The F line from Lamar to Limon would make the least impact on the farm land as most of this route is on pasture land, the G4 line will impact my farmland. I have a powerline across my land now and it is a terrible inconvenience to try to farm around the pole and brace structure.
- I own land in the proposed toll road (falcon prairie Toll Road) corridor and much media attention has now surfaced that the titles to our properties have been flagged to eliminate the sale of those properties. When a title search is ordered and this is revealed the lender will no longer contract on that property. I asked your real estate people at the Hanover meeting if this would happen with your project. No one knew the answer to that only that I would have to disclose the information to the prospective buyer.
- My family ranches in the Limon area, where proposed Eastern Plains Transmission Project may impact our properties with three separate power lines. Specifically, lines K, L, and N are slated for possible construction across our land.
- We're primarily concerned with ultimately having three separate power lines cross the F Cross Ranch. This would seem to exceed one family's share of the area's load. To avoid this scenario, we would especially ask that Alternate Route L1 be eliminated from consideration.
- We understand the need for additional capacity in our area's power grid. But as our land is already home to one 230 KV line (an existing Tri-State power line from Big Sandy to Beaver Creek), we would request some consideration in the planning of these new routes. I'll outline our property involvement for each new route below.
- In combination with other looming threats and encroachments, the Transmission Project will ultimately play a role in devaluing the land such that the ranch's only financially viable alternative may be to sell of property for other land uses.
- The proposed power lines contemplated by the Transmission Project will further fragment existing rangelands and wildlife habitat with access roads and construction impacts.
- There are already a series of power lines crossing the Frost Livestock lands, and Xcel Energy is planning to place new electrical transmission lines across properties in this area in the near future.
- Southern Colorado's Front Range has a rapidly growing population that has created immense development pressures on open lands between Colorado Springs and Pueblo.

Cumulative

- Co-locating energy transmission projects allows shared use of easements, especially temporary construction easements, and consolidates the adverse impacts of the facilities into a single corridor rather than spreading them all over.
- Ironically, it is the more recent residential land uses that both create the need for additional power transmission capacity and benefit from such facilities, while the burdens are borne by long-term ranching families that have protected their land from outside intrusions and encroachments for generations.
- The city of Colorado Springs is now preparing an Environmental Impact Statement for a major water project called the Southern Delivery System that would likely cross Frost Livestock lands.
- The Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS") must consider the cumulative impacts of the Transmission Project in conjunction with impacts to these agricultural properties caused by other reasonably foreseeable future project.
- The potential cumulative impacts of these projects on the continued viability of the existing agricultural operations must be examined in the EIS.
- Each and every government project that attempts make use of this private resource for non-agricultural purposes is incrementally contributing to its ultimate demise.
- To the west, LaFarge- West, Inc. is currently seeking permits for development of a gravel pit and concrete batch plant adjacent to the ranch.
- Finally, the Frost Livestock Ranch lies in the potential path of a \$2.5 billion private toll road and utility corridor planned for Colorado's eastern plains, now known as the Prairie Falcon Parkway Express.
- There are already power lines that run through the property.
- Section 27 is the location of the proposed EPTP alternate power line route and switching station site (identified as M4). For the following reasons, you should choose M3 as the preferred route: 2. There are concerns that this will invite further expansion or addition of even more power related facilities on this property in the future.
- I have also heard that the power lines cannot be installed on the Bohart Ranch because it is State or protected property; however, there is already a aircraft landing strip and other 75 foot transmission lines going through that property.
- We already have a 230 KV line that runs within 1/4 mile of our property.
- The questions we have include: will there be continued growth from this location?
- Your plans are to put a new high line right down the middle of this land. There is a gas line and water line that cross the section North of this land, (section 16 T7S R56W). Please stay on existing line routes or at least put the new lines at the edge of farmed ground.
- We already have two existing high lines crossing much of the ground we farm. We are in the process of purchasing Sec 21 T7S R56W. We have farmed this ground for 55 years.

Cumulative

- We have a longstanding research project on METROGRO Farm and there are concerns that construction and/or permanent presence of the transmission line will compromise the integrity of the project. This project has been continuous since the early 1990s and is expected to continue through at least 2011.
- The Metro District land applies biosolids to certain fields within the METROGRO Farm at any given time. It is not necessarily the typical seasonal type farming operation throughout the year. There could also be any number of special projects taking place on the Farm at any given time, such as road projects, conservation projects, on-going research projects, chemical spraying, etc.
- Because there is already a transmission line going through there, I want to see the alternative route J5 used.
- I ask you to use the alternative route or other suggestions I have provided north of Highway 94 where a transmission line already exists, or whatever is necessary to avoid her by a few more miles. Thank you, Robert Paul.
- However I would like to see transmission lines put where they are needed and kept confined as much as possible to existing right of ways, not scattered everywhere.
- If you both need towers in the same areas, will that end up doubling the number of towers and lines we have to view and make room for?
- This seems like a lot of power lines in a very narrow corridor 5 major lines in less than four miles!
- We already have 1 transmission line on our property and don't really want another.
- It looks like to us that the proposed routes will be putting two more lines across our land. We already have 1 line and we feel that the other two would really ruin our land for being able to farm the land.
- Too many major power lines in a 4 mile corridor- 5 major lines in 4 miles!
- Five major lines in a four mile corridor will have a negative impact on these birds as this is a major feeding area for them.
- Big Sandy to Green Valley: L2 needs to be located next to and parallel to K1 with both being on the west side of the existing line from Big Sandy to Beaver Creek until it almost (sic) the Washington-Lincoln county line and then follow L1 to the west until it become L3, This option avoids the Western Union tower located in sec 2 6S 56W, Less farmland would be impacted with this route rather than the proposed L2 route.
- Note: all metal roof on home and buildings.
- Hawk nest on SE corner of property. What will high voltage do to a raptor nest? The line will not be in corridor.
- Potential impacts to water sources (livestock) 200' clearance.

Electrical Characteristics

- After viewing the locations, and speaking with your representatives about our concerns with animals grazing, farming operations, and electrical interruptions we have no concerns with this crossing our properties and support the choices you've made to cross through our properties as we continue with day to day operations- Christine & Greg Talbert.
- What types of audible noise are produced- how far away from line can I hear the noise? (talked with Bob Pearson).
- Prefer the route to cross the farm ground than the grass land. Concerned about stray voltage, icing dropping off on cattle.
- What effect will T. line have on the metal water pipes that run from our place? Will I get shocked from hydrants?
- Induced voltages on fences also. Temporary electric fence- how prevent increased voltages on an electric fence?
- To interference now w/ small distribution line. What would this proposal do?
- I enjoy my quiet. Power lines hum, devalue property, and will mess up the beautiful sunrise.
- The electrical interference.
- The continuous noise from the lines, constant humming.
- I will suffer the rest of the time I live here having to deal with the continuous problems of the power lines humming, popping and the static discharge from the lines, not to mention that I do not have full use of my land.
- The ground vibrations.
- Then there is the question of devaluation. Studies have shown that the presence of high voltage power lines and the popular opinion of their danger.
- I am ok with changing the wood pole system with the steel ones, but do not want an increase in voltage being passed along that line.
- Two, at what ever volume they are currently at, they omitt [sic] a loud humming sound during the rain and/or snow. Loud enough to hear it from my front door which is about 100 yards away.
- She asked my relationship to the project and my background in EMF. I told her that I am a consultant to WAPA and that I have published research on the subject and also spoken to other principle investigators in the EMF research field. I offered to send her a copy of my published research articles and a link to the EMF RAPID web page at NIH so she can download their EMF brochure.
- Xcel was working with Motorola to correct the problem.
- Ernie had called WAPA on February 21, 2007 about concerns with radio interference and effects on his organic farming practices from the proposed EPTP project. I (Bob Pearson) called Ernie on February 22nd to discuss his concerns.

Electrical Characteristics

- He uses 2 way radios and they already are interfered with along the Xcel Holcomb to Lamar 345 kV line that was recently built.
- I suggested that he talk to Danny Pearson of Xcel's transmission engineering group. I called Danny and asked that he call Ernie to discuss these concerns.
- Ernie asked if he would have similar problems with the new line and I said that we had understood that his Motorola radios were similar to those other farmers had problems with along the Xcel line.
- That solution should also reduce any possibility that Ernie's radios would have interference from the new line.
- She had some concerns about EMF and I stated that if she could attend the public meeting in her area, they would probably have a person there knowledgeable on the subject that could answer her questions.
- Mr. Glover called because he is an attorney and has a client whose property may be affected by the project. He provided me with the legal description of his client's property (Section 30 T20S, R62W; sections 13, 24, 25, T20S, R63W) and asked for the voltage of the line. It was determined from the maps that it will be a 500kV line.
- I was told the reason for two lines was to avoid weather related problems, however both lines are close enough together on the proposal that if a storm damaged one line it would likely get both.
- Sec. 14 has an existing 345 kV line along the west boundary, with the addition of the proposed B-1 line through the middle of the sec. it creates a box canyon effect.
- I have enough interference with my 2-way radios, noise, AM radio and field obstructions to need anymore.
- They will forward legals for the maps and complete a comment form in relation to the EMF issues. Sections 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 28, 33, & 34 T4S R58W; Sections 3, 4, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 28, 29, 32, 33, 34 & 35 T5S R58W; Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 13, 24 & 25 T6S R58W; Sections 1-36 T6S R57W.
- She mentioned that she would not be able to attend the public meeting but she was concerned about EMF and wanted further information on that. I stated that I believed a person would be present at the meeting who could provide information on that subject and she decided to send her husband if he could make it.
- Magnetic fields on existing livestock fencing, existing livestock wells powered by wind or electricity.
- B3 17-23-34. We have an irrigation well located in the SW corner of this section. If the line runs over the well it would be difficult to work on the line with power in there.

Electrical Characteristics

- If requested, we can supply the latest information and studies showing such health risks, including but not limited to the California Department of Health and Sciences evaluation and June 2005 British Medical Journal finding showing unequivocal causal links between electromagnetic fields and substantial health risks including leukemia.
- We have conducted a careful study of the adverse effects of electromagnetic fields and know of no long-term studies conducted regarding the health risks associated with 1,200 kilovolts of power.
- The electromagnetic radiation generated by transmission lines has been documented to interfere with the operation of this type of equipment and that type of interference will further adversely impact active farmland use of property under and in the vicinity of the powerlines.
- In addition and equally important, while the scientific studies relative to health impacts resulting from proximity to high voltage transmission lines may not be conclusive one way or another, there is certainly a public perception that it is undesirable to have a home and to reside in close proximity to electrical transmission facilities and there is a mark of stigma which diminishes the value of homes in proximity to such facilities.
- Will static electricity effect vegetation growth during high moisture times, drought years?
- The effect of the magnetic field on ag equipment (Computers).
- Objections to proposed Route J4 as shown on Sheet Map 9: Along the proposed Route J4 as it runs from Limon south to a point approximately 13 miles south of Limon, then turns southwesterly, crosses highway 71, and passes off of Sheet Map 9, it directly impacts at least 10 residences in terms of view and electrical interferences. That would not be as true of an alternative such as J1, since the pastureland is more sparsely settled.
- Electro magnetic field giving out by transmission lines- A. Messing with Sat. GPS posing, B. Computers in farm machinery.
- I fear the presence of the proposed transmission lines will interfere with amateur radio transmission and reception to the west. Specifically the 2 meter band to Colorado Springs and vicinity and the 10, 15 and 20 meter bands to Asia, Australia, and New Zealand. Additionally, I suspect that local radio and TV reception will be adversely affected.
- Joe Ewertz – questions regarding 2-way radio interference and GPS interference.
- 49 Road south of Highway 40; EMF concerns (talked with Bob Pearson).
- Ralph Brent – T7SR53W, Section 17; has alternatives on two sides of his house; would like alternative moved to west (drawn on map); asked about electric fences (referred to Bob Pearson).
- What is the ground clearance of a 500-kv line.
- Are you going to use guy wires on this line?
- Do not split the farmland along the north-south part of J4 How will the electrical lines affect the computer controls on machinery, for example the spraying controls on big sprayers?

Electrical Characteristics

- Electric fences divide this section of her property into several pastures-- how are electric fences affected?
- The line will interfere with cell phone reception, television, and radio.
- Fences and grounding.
- We need to use newer technology to transmit power over long distances-- she can't believe we are still using transmission lines-- isn't there anything newer and better?
- The effect to people and cattle. Now and in the future.
- Will static electricity effect [sic] vegetation growth during hi moisture times, drought years?
- How will the magnetic field effect cellular phones?
- Will this line have a negative effect on small aircraft instruments; ability to fly into the area.
- Static electricity causing hair on cattle to stand up.
- Will there be effects on instrument panels, spray planes, tractors, combines, etc.?
- What effect will it have on communication, cell phones, radios, TV's, Computers?
- As I stated in my telecon with Jim, my wife and I were surprised that we were potentially affected by subject project. The attachment to your letter did not indicate that the line that was imposed on the attachment, north of our property line, was not identified as a proposed Transmission line. Jim was especially helpful in answering questions regarding the dimensions of the tower footprint and the exposure of the high line to the property as measured from the centerline.
- Also worried about EMF effects on pipelines (water and gas).
- Finally, additional power lines and related facilities will increase electromagnetic fields on the ranch, creating the potential for harm to wildlife, livestock and area residents.
- Radio and TV reception at our residence will be affected. Also we have concerns about door openers, cell phones, electric fences and barbed wire fences.
- What are the potential interferences with cell phone, radio, and/or GPS systems that could result from both the construction and continued operation of the transmission line?
- Does Colorado have any set guidelines for electric/magnetic field levels for newly constructed transmission lines? If so, what are they?
- Along the proposed Route J4 as it runs from Limon south to a point approximately 13 miles south of Limon, then turns southwesterly, crosses highway 71, and passes off of Sheet Map 9, it directly impacts at least 10 residences in terms of view and electrical interferences. That would not be as true of an alternative such as J1, since the pastureland is more sparsely settled.
- Our animals have no water when the electricity is interrupted, and we have to check all of the automatic waterers every time there is a power surge. Our farm sprinklers shut off every time there is a power surge. It is not that simple, short interruption of service that rights itself in a split second. There are major impacts whenever we lose power even if it is temporary.

Electrical Characteristics

- We have livestock that will be sensitive to the noise level that we as human may not hear all the time, plus the EMF.
- Married in 1969- raised family- now raising granddaughters (doing very well- honor roll/ student council/ scholarship awarded) Do not want at risk at any level- she is and will be a great asset to us all. You cannot and will not give us (written) guarantee [sic] that lines are safe i.e.: EMF- noise (effects on nervous system & general health, cancer).
- EMFs/ Noise @ human hearing & above & below human range, but still effecting humans and animals.
- A 100- 140 tower can not be contained if it falls in a 200' easement if its base is 50, that leaves 75 feet to each side to fall. And cables can fall also.
- It may take more poles and be more costly in the "short-term" but farmers look at the future. Towers are not cost-effective over time.
- I am asking to see the evaluation made as to environmental justice, land use- residential, economic values and visual resources as to the effect on my home site that are planned for the N 1/2, S-31, T-1N, R-63W.
- These lines that are going to Colorado have no benefit to us.
- I was going to buy the land and live there? It would be a family farms as well as a family wind farm so it would be hard to up and walk away.

Environmental Justice

- Why would the Project look for reroutes to avoid houses in some areas, but not others?
- Why would the project reroute for a gun club, but not residences?
- The criteria developed by the Western Area Power Administration to evaluate potential locations for electrical transmission lines, as described in the January 2007 Transmission Project newsletter, unfairly discriminate against historic agricultural lands in favor of more recent residential developments and land uses.
- Ironically, it is the more recent residential land uses that both create the need for additional power transmission capacity and benefit from such facilities, while the burdens are borne by long-term ranching families that have protected their land from outside intrusions and encroachments for generations.
- Doing any of this would severely encroach upon my rights as a citizen by affecting my way of life.
- I am writing to ask you to stop the Eastern Plains Transmission Project as it is currently planned. It seems the homeowners in the area have been forgotten and stand to lose large parcels of their land, as well as the pristine environment they sought in settling there.
- The state of Colorado should not have the right to w/hold access across that land. In trade for our property and safety.

Environmental Justice

- I do recognize the need and necessity for electrical power access to be increased. I do also however, recognize the necessity for Americans of all walks of life to be allowed to be free of choice in their lives and lifestyles. I do not want to take away any of the rights of others. I know this must go in somewhere.
- Mr. Tarabino wanted to know if EPTP was looking at the possibility of developing BPL on EPTP. I informed him that he should talk with Lee Boughey at Tri-State, (he was provided with Lee Boughey's contact information). Also, he requested that the scoping material be sent to him. Kristina was going to send Mr. Tarabino a packet of scoping information.
- N3 goes through bottom ground- difficult to service and floods. N2 and N4 preferred.
- Biological issues (wildlife habitat, wetlands).
- On proposed segment k10 identified possible floodplain of the sand creek. Must check with FEMA. Possible re-draw 1 mile to east or west. Map 4.
- Sec 21, T11S R56W marshy land identified near proposed J4 route. Map 9.
- An area of steep hills and wet ground were identified as well as farmland near proposed J4 route Sec. 21 T11S R56W. Map 9.
- Identification of wetland area under J10 proposed route, Sec. 19 T15S R62W. Map 12.
- The proposed J4 route crosses active wetlands at the point where it turns in a southwesterly direction. The adverse environmental impact on those wetlands can and should be avoided the selection of an alternate route.
- Also, it will go through our pasture where it is very boggy and will be very difficult to build and maintain without severely damaging the area.
- High moisture/water on section 21 (wet lands). Muddy unstable clay soils.

Floodplains/Wetlands

- My main concern for the proposed route is the crossing of section 21, T11S, R56W. This property is mostly wetland and is sometimes impassable with a pickup. Long Creek runs thru the middle of this section.
- Wendy Figureroa (CDOW) – asked question about phosphorescent bird flight diverters use in wetland/riparian areas; will send link to literature.
- My main concern for the proposed route <J4> is the crossing of section 21, T11S, R56W, is that this property is mostly wetland and is sometimes almost impassable with a pickup. Long Creek runs thru the middle of this section.
- Please note that there are two draws (intermittent streams on the property).
- Frost Livestock lands contain native vegetation including cacti and grasses, riparian areas, wetlands and playa that provide habitat for numerous wildlife species, raptors and migratory birds.

Floodplains/Wetlands

- This property (as your own map clearly show) is a wetland. It consists, for the most part, of wet, muddy, unstable clay soils year round as there is an underground spring which cuts the section in half from north to south. You point out in your own literature that water and high amounts of electricity don't mix.
- It also crosses wetlands and one of the most picturesque meadows on the north fork of the smoky hill river on section 13-10S-40W.
- Please consider any alternative for this line that goes west, rather than south of Limon across pasture rather than farmland, and that impacts fewer residences. You will have to cross Interstate 70 and the Big Sandy Creek either way, so that is not a factor.
- On sheet map 9, on J4 approximately 13 miles south of Limon where it turns southwesterly, there is a wetland.
- Please be advised that the subject property located in the SE 1/4 section 23-11-41W in Wallace County, Kansas is subject to an existing conservation easement granted to the United States. The easement is a Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP) interest authorized by Title 16 USC 3837, et. Seq. and implemented by the Code of Federal Regulations at 7 CFR 1467. The Natural Resources and Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture is the administering agency. Because the United States is the true party in interest, it is exempt from legal process pursuant to the doctrine of sovereign immunity.
- The purpose of this program is the preservation and restoration of wetlands and associated lands. Subsequent to conveyance of the easement, a Wetlands Reserve Plan of Operations (WRPO) is designed to accomplish these goals and the landowner, who retains the fee, agrees to implementation of same. The easement restricts the use of the affected property, as defined by program regulations and restoration/preservation objectives. Any and all activities that conflict with program objectives and the WRPO are prohibited.
- Mrs. Michel is interested in interconnecting to the EPTP transmission system. She would like to have her land included (I believe she is talking about wind interconnection).
- Mr. Brown stated that he received a notice referencing EPTP and is specifically inquiring about any interest "we" may have in a Wind Power System located in Oklahoma (inter connect).
- Mr. Fix had questions regarding the proximity of the proposed alternative routes to his property near Wray, CO. He provided legal descriptions of his property, the maps were downloaded with the proposed alternative routes over-laid on the maps. Mr. Fix also would like to speak to someone at Tri-State about a potential wind farm and interconnect issues that he is pursuing. T 1N R43W S30 SE 1/4, T 1N R 44W S 13,24,25 SW1/4, 32 S1/2, T 1S R 44 W S 4 E1/2 of NW1/4.
- [G5] closer to possible wind farm development areas in both Cheyenne and Kit Carson counties.

Generation

- There are several wind farm being planned are just south of the G5 route and the placement of this route would make it easier to develop these wind farms in my opinion. Anyway, that is the public perception.
- Will you consider wind energy?
- Would it save money on freight for coal and elec. Loss by putting the plant in WY.
- I am delighted that Morgan County is interested in alternative energy sources. I feel we could use another cite [sic] for the location. I would be delighted to have a power transmission project located midway between Wiggins and Ft. Morgan.
- I will lobby hard at our state capitol against any power project.
- This would not add further line but would get closer to some of the best wind in the state.
- I am from Baca county and interested in wind generation.
- In current negotiations for wind farm.
- I would like my property to be used to generate electricity with the windmills. Or I would like to grow corn to be used for fuel.
- What is the viability of the coal projects- are they going to be built or is this just planning stage preparation- when will final approval be granted?
- What, if any, consideration has been made by TriState/Western to the design and routing of such transmission lines to accommodate the interconnection of renewable (primarily wind) energy projects along its path?
- Would property on the proposed route be considered "on grid" enough to allow wind farm input into the grid?
- Mr. Bradshaw asked if wind generation would be allowed to tie into this system, my reply was that the interconnect issues are dealt with by Tri-State, he asked if having a wind farm close to transmission lines was better or worse (better as far as construction costs).
- Identification of proposed 50-100 MW wind farm and met tower (CVP) in Sec. 23-24 T10S R41W and Sec. 19 T10S R40W under B18. Map 37.
- My concern to this project is I have signed a contract with Crossing Trails Wind Power project- Horizon Wind Energy to build wind turbines on my property and your Transmission project is needed in this area, for this wind farm.

Generation

- Is it better to go with many mid size turbines or few utility size turbines. What is the cost difference including install? What is the acres needed differences? What is the output differences? What are the payoff time differences? What is the time differences on install? Several companies say there delivery date is 2009 for purchases right now. Is there a manufacturer of wind turbines that is better than another? Is there one to avoid? Is there a difference in price for almost the same product? What about developers? I was thinking of going with a developer so I had some one to do all the work with all the connections and experience. Is there one developer better than another developer? Is there one to avoid? Is there a difference in price for same services? I am not wanting to make a lot the early years (reinvest or pay of project debts) but do want it to pay for itself an increase profit as it is paid off with my profit more in the long term for me and with the debt getting paid in the short term. I would like to find a partner, mentor, teacher, coach, advice or adviser, developer/manufacturer or someone to just teach me and walk me threw the process. Everything from starting my business to the operation of the wind farm. There is a lot to redo on the web but seems vague and without detail or it contradicts each other or they are not relevant to my situation there either large G&T scale in triple MW or small residential maybe up to a kw. Even if nothing else but answers to some of my questions or just general info. Any help is appreciated.
- I am starting a wind/solar distributed generation farm in eastern Colorado. I have a lot of questions in a lot of categories if you can help?
- I am wanting to know about financing, prices, funding, manufactures, developers, business plan and grants. What are my options? How do I find them?
- What is the best way to get startup capital? How do I find them? I want as many grants as I can get from as many different departments for as many different purposes all for the same project. How many different stages of funding or grants and financing are there? What are the qualifications and requirements? Is there funding or grants to be found from the seed stage and purchasing land with a house all the way to project paid off? How much can I get in funding> What do I need to be classified as to qualify for the most funding> (individual, corporation, LLC, Inc., coop, business, farm, power producer)?
- Can I fall into or use multiple categories? What about corporate gifts and sponsorships? Like large users might want to be able to say, yes, were doing that and would want to be identified as providing green energy. How do I find them? Where should I start?
- Everyone says the first step is wind data or testing the site. I wasn't concerned about this step because I wanted to use the taller towers. I was planning on going as high as I or the manufacturer could go or basically the tallest towers available for the product being installed. Plus the slow wind areas in Colorado are at least 10mph and Eastern Colorado is at 14mph or better at 30m. Elbert County is almost 18mph at 100m.
- Questions about wind generation interconnections; too expensive on 500kV line (referred her to Lee).
- Dave Sharman – 37 years with NRCS; interested in consulting regarding re-vegetation (970-842-0232); also interested in wind interconnection and Western's system.

Generation

- Does not agree with project – it isn't needed – he has enough power; build generation on front range and leave him alone; concern about farming around structures for the rest of his life; no amount of money can pay for that; wife discussed option of putting line on north side of existing line between Big Sandy and Burlington because of CRP land and absentee owners (noted on map) -- husband doesn't like that either because he would still have to look at it and doesn't think project is needed. Lee and Carey talked to extensively.
- It is a "sham" to not have more precise maps! I could not go to the Limon meetings due to a medical emergency. As I read the proposals to put a power generation plant west of Garden City, powered by coal, The Plan seems to be "flawed".
- If you are "close minded" to Solar and Wind the least you could do is build the coal fired Power Plant next to the coal mine and not burn millions of gallons of diesel fuels in trains to transport the coal from Wyoming to Garden City, KS.
- First you want Power to the Front Range and Western Slope. Put in Wind Farms and Solar Farms along the locations that require energy and build fewer miles of lines and no coal to transport or burn.
- For example, Invenergy, LLC has proposed to construct a natural gas power plant called the Squirrel Creek Energy Center on Colorado State Land Board property located just north of the Frost Livestock Ranch.
- Ironically, Helen Emig from the wind farms in Lamar is my first cousin-- I am assuming that these proposed lines are in part transmitting some of that generation.
- Will future wind farm projects be able to "tap" into the line for transmission of wind generated power?
- Will Western Area Power Administration be the one that guarantee the finances on the Power lines and the power plants?
- Is there going space on the lines for renewable energy?
- I don't feel that we on the eastern plains need the extra power. It seems that most of the power will be going to the front range and western slope, so it would make more sense to me to build the plant closer to the coal and to the demand for the electricity than to build lines and transport the coal, possibly southwestern Wyoming.

Health and Safety

- Concerns in regards to health effects?
- Safety considerations with the power lines being in close proximity of homes.
- Safety considerations with the power lines being in close proximity of homes.
- Though it would be a hardship to pack up our clan yet again we would gladly relocate to remove our children from this scenario.

Health and Safety

- Then there is the question of devaluation. Studies have shown that the presence of high voltage power lines and the popular opinion of their danger.
- Aside from the aesthetic and health concerns there are very real worries about the safety of our children during what promises to be a long drawn out construction process.
- While American studies have netted mixed results, European studies such as those from Oxford University, have shown up to 70% increased risk of childhood leukemia and SIDS in children who reside within 200 meters of high voltage lines. The proximity of our home to the proposed line puts us into that range.
- It also presents a more immediate danger during construction. We are told the construction crew will be setting up trailers, excavating with heavy equipment, drilling anchoring holes, assembling the towers on site (here) and erecting them with cranes and helicopters.
- Angela has sent WAPA an email addressing concerns about EMF health effects on the proposed EPTP project. I called Angela on February 8 to discuss her concerns and left her a message. She returned my call on February 9. I called her again and this time we spoke live.
- She is concerned that one of the two routes for the Midway to Big Sandy line will run quite close to her house. She is a practitioner in the healthcare field (details unknown) so she apparently has some understanding of human health effects.
- I am a no till farmer and spraying around power poles is dangerous.
- She had some concerns about EMF and I stated that if she could attend the public meeting in her area, they would probably have a person there knowledgeable on the subject that could answer her questions.
- She mentioned that she would not be able to attend the public meeting but she was concerned about EMF and wanted further information on that. I stated that I believed a person would be present at the meeting who could provide information on that subject and she decided to send her husband if he could make it.
- Concerns: 1. The environmental impact on my property 2. The decrease in value 3. The on-going disruption and adverse effects on human, plant, and animal life.
- Our health being that close.
- One of our main concerns is our health in living so close to these transmission lines.
- We have conducted a careful study of the adverse affects of electromagnetic fields and know of no long-term studies conducted regarding the health risks associated with 1,200 kilovolts of power.
- However, we are acutely aware of grave health concerns resulting from lines with lower kilovolts.
- At present, we are involved in a lawsuit with Public Service Company of Colorado, Pueblo County District Court Case Number 06CV1902 regarding the health risks posed by the proposed construction of the above-mentioned 345-kilovolt electric transmission line.

Health and Safety

- A family lives in and upon Owl Canyon Property. Cattle are also being raised in such area. Clearly, submitting a family and livestock to this amount of kilovolts is an unacceptable health risk.
- At some point we need to be concerned with a tower coming down or a line down, especially if it crosses a fence line. My concern is not only for the livestock (who tend to bunch up along a fence in a storm) but for our own safety as well.
- The effect to people and cattle. Now and in the future.
- if this is a problem- then move your families there and see how many medical problems you encounter.
- What are the health concerns toward cattle and people? Have you done studies that confirm 100% that the lines do not affect livestock and human health. Remember people eat the cattle also!
- How have improvements been made to prevent birth defects that have been caused in other areas of the US?
- Will animal growth be effected [sic]?
- I went from being the proposed route to an alternative route at this last session. I sincerely hope that does not change. I had many concerns regarding health issues, property resale values, and right of way accesses that I expressed last fall.
- An alternative route is near his property and he has great concerns as he is building a house on it and has young children that he worries about because of health concerns.
- Finally, additional power lines and related facilities will increase electromagnetic fields on the ranch, creating the potential for harm to wildlife, livestock and area residents.
- This property (as your own map clearly show) is a wetland. It consists, for the most part, of wet, muddy, unstable clay soils year round as there is an underground spring which cuts the section in half from north to south. You point out in your own literature that water and high amounts of electricity don't mix.
- Placing these on my land will be making it a danger to my clients to hunt in these areas due to hitting a power line with pellets or birds flying and getting tangled up in the power lines.
- Cattle grazing there in the winter are more apt to be shocked by the power lines.
- Flammable within the easement area.
- We have 4000 gal storage tanks for both gasoline & diesel on our farmstead. All of which have electric pumps.
- We have serious concerns about the possible adverse health risks.
- We all understand the importance of growth but we as a community are concerned with our investments, property devaluation, health.

Health and Safety

- What are the health/safety issues related to this development and how are they being addressed? Thank you for giving us this opportunity to share our concerns.
- If requested, we can supply the latest information and studies showing such health risks, including but not limited to the California Department of Health and Sciences evaluation and June 2005 British Medical Journal finding showing unequivocal causal links between electromagnetic fields and substantial health ns including leukemia.
- One of your EPTP brochures suggests that flammables should not be placed within the easement area of the power lines. Obviously, active farming activity involves a greater use of an dependence on flammable materials, such as fuel products, than a ranch or grazing use of the property.
- In addition and equally important, while the scientific studies relative to health impacts resulting from proximity to high voltage transmission lines may not be conclusive one way or another, there is certainly a public perception that it is undesirable to have a home and to reside in close proximity to electrical transmission facilities and there is a mark of stigma which diminishes the value of homes in proximity to such facilities.
- We are also very concerned about the potential health issues related to living in such close proximity to such a large scale power line.
- I attended the informational meeting your group hosted in Limon, Colorado on 2/13/07, and requested information regarding data on health risks associated with living close to large power lines such as what is being proposed.
- My two greatest concerns are: Safety and health concerns living near the lines.
- Our son and his family live in the area in question and our first concern would be possible adverse health effects and loss of property.
- This effects [sic] our family, friends, and neighbors who live in these areas. We are concerned about adverse health issues, property values.
- I have concerns about my grandchildren growing up around power poles, because of the health risks that are coming out on kids who live close to power poles, Cancer concerns for one. There are already test being done on adults who lived under power poles.
- How has improvements been made to prevent birth defects that were caused in other areas of the US?
- How has improvement been made to prevent birth defects that were caused in other areas of the US?
- Property damage caused by Transmission line failure, such as [damaged].
- Health concerns such as cancer, birth defects.
- The health effects are also an issue.

Health and Safety

- Aerial applicators may not work around big transmission lines. It is too dangerous. There will be a long way where they can not fly, the quality of the application will go down.
- These lines cause cancer in babies.
- Marcia Shafer is under my care for treatment of Vascular Cephalgia, Chemical Sensitivity, Chest Pain, Chest Wall Syndrome, Dermatitis, Irritable Bowel Syndrome, Myalgia, Premenstrual Syndrome, Rhinosinusitis, Toxic Brain Syndrome, Candidiasis, Food Sensitivity, Adrenal Insufficiency, Fibrositis, Nutritional Deficiency, Immunodeficiency, and Electro-magnetic hypersensitivity. She can experience an acute exacerbation of her symptoms resulting from exposure to incitants which are at concentrations well within the ranges considered safe for the average population. Her symptoms will vary with severity, type, and duration of exposure. Ms. Schafer is under a program of strict avoidance of exposure to incitants. This include exposure to petrochemicals, solvents, cleaners, pesticides, perfumes, fragrances, cleaning products, carpeting, cigarette smoke, minimal variation in heat and cold, vinyl and upholstered furniture, clothing and fabrics, unfiltered air, unfiltered water, photocopier chemical and supplies, dust and mites, pollens, molds, Formaldehyde-based materials, car exhaust, heavy metals, and other compounds. Even casual exposures to any of these commonly-encountered environmental agents can be detrimental to her health. Strict avoidance is the most important aspect of her treatment. Ms. Schafer must rigidly avoid public buildings or any environment where exposure may occur. Her significant sensitivities require her to reside in a porcelain-lined trailer or other special housing that is constructed of non-offending materials with reduced or eliminated electro-magnetic exposure. These sensitivities also limit her contact with visitors as she has to rigidly avoid potential contaminants. Visitors must be seen outdoors to avoid contamination of her living environment and they must also be diligent in removing such items as watches, pagers, magnets, and other potential incitants to her electro-magnetic sensitivities. If you require additional information, please contact my office at 214-368-4132. Sincerely William J. Rea, MD.
- Please KNOW that I am not sharing/sending this for ANY undue leverage, but just so that you will know, my request in asking you to work with me is not some "imagined" need, etc. Thank you for considering my information and request.
- Robert Paul's land (NE 1/4 of section 4 T- 15S, R60W)--- which is at Gieck and Whittemore in Rush, CO--- is land used to provide safe/medically sound housing/ circumstances for me. My glass lined dwelling is built into the hill on his land--- and due to my medical conditions (documented and verified), I am housebound and live under very different circumstances/ conditions than most people. My dwelling and person are unmovable.
- Would you try to work with me, to go around me by a few more miles to make it possible for me to survive and continue to progress? I know you must do SOMETHING... but if you would try to avoid me by slightly more distance (given I live away from even small power lines) this would be a great help to me. I live with minimal voltage, no electromagnetic devices/appliances... (sic) to health complications from these incitants already.

Health and Safety

- Due to medical conditions, I am housebound and live under very different conditions than most individuals. The dwelling I live in--- took years to construct and cure and set up as non-toxic and non-metal (non conductive) and is built INTO the hill, unmovable on the land.
- Mr. Hartman and staff/ associates: Mr. Paul's land is used to provide safe/ medically sound housing for me--- a patient under long term care for extreme environmental/ electromagnetic sensitivities.
- Mr. Paul--- the landowner on whose land my special dwelling resides, has already communicated these ideas and thoughts--- My own in regard to my needs are in the attached letter and inside page comments--- If you could help, by avoiding me--- and this special situation by a few more miles this would be a great assistance to my continued recovery/ survival...
- Marcia Schafer (resident on Robert Paul's land--- in special/ glass lined/ medical housing) Verifiable by medical letter and also honored by the Commander of the 302nd AW Wing at Peterson Field--- where the pilots have for some time flown around/ avoided my location to accommodate this situation...).
- Greetings, Mr. Hartman (staff and associates): As a woman under long-term care for extreme sensitivities... chemical/ electromagnetic/ environmental, my reasons for asking that you might avoid my location by a few more miles is entirely different from most of those coming your direction.
- What are the animal and/or human health risks associated with working in the proximity to the transmission line and/or towers?
- We don't want it near our land, because of the proven health risks it will bring to our community.
- Please look at another route, north of Hwy 94. Please put it in open pasture where it won't impact our children's and family's health.
- My land was chosen for this unique, special structure and patient for many reasons. The property is ideal for her health and survival on it in away from small powerlines on 3 sides. Contains only underground power lines on the land and shields her also from electromagnetic towers and interference from surrounding areas due to it being a hill.
- I have summarized both pertinent issues in my two previous answers, However, I ask again that you take into consideration of the needs of the special/ medical/ documented situation on my property.
- My land is 4 miles SW of Rush, Colorado in (NE 1/4 sec 4 T15S R60W) I was part of the construction crew also that designed and built the GLASSLINED special residence for Marcia Schafer-- which took time to construct and find materials for that were suitable, nontoxic, and non conductive electromagnetically. This building is built into the side of the hill and it cannot be moved and her condition is such that she cannot be moved to alternative housing.
- Also, there are health risks involved with such high-power lines.
- The two main concerns with the routes are safety concerns at the Limon airport and concern about the visibility of the power lines.

Health and Safety

- Put the powerline through that valley would also seem to lessen the chance that aircraft would hit those power lines.
- Safety concerns at the Limon Airport: Limon's airport landing strip runs north and south. The prevailing winds are from the North. This means planes must approach the airport from the south. Proposed routes J2 & J3 (Midway to Big Sandy) would cross the flight path for an approach from the south. Therefore route J1 would be the preferred route for the Midway to Big Sandy powerline.
- Safety concerns at the Limon Airport: On the energy center to Big Sandy route proposed routes F8 and F9 and F11 would tend to encroach into flights from the south. Therefore, route F-10 which approaches the Big Sandy substation from the east would be the preferred route.
- I am concerned about the potential health risks of proximity to high voltage, and possible aesthetic damage, both of which could negatively impact the use, enjoyment, and value of my land.
- In addition, I have been treated to a rare form of cancer that is not very responsive to treatment. In addition to surgery and radiation, I have made several lifestyle and diet changes that seem to be helpful since my doctors consider it remarkable that I have not had any recurrence this past year. I would obviously like to avoid close exposure to those things that might be a cancer trigger for susceptible individuals.
- The population of Colorado is growing, regardless of lack of water or available infrastructure. We recognize you need to provide the electricity it takes to serve those people. But we fail to understand why you have to impact the very things we value to serve others. If your structures are not a public health hazard, why do you need to avoid more direct routes just so you are not placing your towers in areas of higher density housing?
- Finally, I have viewed the literature that was provided to me. There are many statements about the lack of conclusive evidence that the high voltage lines are a health hazard, but that is not the same as stating that there is no proof of any health impacts. There are many studies that you do not provide that indicate a potential for increased cancer risks to humans, and reproductive failures in animals. Just to get it in the record: I do breed racehorses as a business.
- Health risk to people and animals.
- What if a tower or line falls or comes apart in wind or snow/ice storm?
- How long will it take you to get here to stop danger to us?
- No doubt power is essential to life's conveniences but the concerns are not to be devalued, I am worried about the effect it will have on my family, property devaluation for if I worry about my families health, why would someone put there family in harms way.
- Our home will be within the one mile corridor, I'm concerned about our community investments, future investing, property devaluation health of my family and myself and our livestock.
- Our children.

Health and Safety

- Cost of powerlines vs. cost of American rights & safety issues.
- Lines falling or towers falling due to Tornados icing, w/ high winds.
- Being near the lines on a constant basis, i.e.: living by lines- studies available do show effects lines need miles not feet & yards of distance to be safe. Your company says there is no guarantee of absolute safety but the company is eager & willing to put us and animals at "risk" anyway. WE ARE NOT!
- A 100- 140 tower can not be contained if it falls in a 200' easement if its base is 50, that leaves 75 feet to each side to fall. And cables can fall also.
- The state of Colorado should not have the right to w/hold access across that land. In trade for our property and safety.
- Safe (?) electrical routing- less human contact/ exposure.
- Married in 1969- raised family- now raising granddaughters (doing very well- honor roll/ student council/ scholarship awarded) Do not want at risk at any level- she is and will be a great asset to us all. You cannot and will not give us (written) garuntee [sic] that lines are safe i.e.: EMF- noise (effects on nervous system & general health, cancer).
- Others should not have right to alter our pre-existing properties. Do not put our families & properties at risk on "uncertain risks" How would you feel?
- To protect our children and families do not gamble with our lives for the gain of others, We- all Americans- have the right to not be put at risk.
- My children, family, horses, animals, house, barn, neighbors, and what effects it will have.
- I have small children and this is a major concern to me. My children are my life.
- Do you have a garrantee [sic] that this will not hurt my children or me in any way?
- For storms, place tower south of roads.
- There is no doubt that this power line would have detrimental impacts on our health, the value of our land, and diminished re-sale values, not to mention the negative visual effects and electric interference with radio, television, etc.
- We are extremely concerned about the health and financial well being of these neighbors as well as our own, since the proposed power line would pass very near all of us.
- I plan to retire to my land. I am a healthcare provider and do hope that I will not be near these lines.
- Along with the package I am sending to you is a comment form and letter w/documentation from a lady that we would very much so like to avoid with the line routing. She has a medical condition that you should be aware of. Her legal description and location is included in that package.

Health and Safety

- I we can not avoid everyone, Then lets try our very best to avoid as many as possible at any cost. Our concerns are as real as everyone else's. No one has given or will give us (so to speak, a guarantee. Much less a written one.) That this won't devalue our properties and/or damage our health. Would anyone in today's time. Be willing to buy anything on the sat so of the sales person who's job is to sell you that product or idea, with our something in writing as to the promises he makes on that idea or product? I believe not.
- The company is willing to "risk" ours health and lives on lack of studies that prove either side in their opinion and their advisor's opinions. WE ARE NOT!
- Two properties 100 yr homesteads one has site of Belleview school house (one room)
- Also my property has the site of the Belleview school, a one room school built by my family and their neighbors.
- Dissecting one section- Section 13, 14, 11 Township 4 60W. All sections have Indian campsites and artifacts dated back to Woodland culture, approximately 500-600AD.
- Dissecting registered 100 year Colorado Centennial Ranch.
- Centennial Ranch, Indian artifacts and campsites, fragile land, land has significant future value compared to suggested re-route.
- Because alternate route would be on family homestead that is recognized by the state of Colorado & Colorado Historical Society as 100 year farm/ranch that has been in same family over 100 years.
- An additional power line is definitely in opposition to the character of Craig Ranch Bed & Breakfast, LLC & Horse Motel. Direct quotes from our website that do not agree with the proposed power line follows: "Pile in the pick truck and let the Craigs share the history of their Colorado ranch property, including Heddingers Lake Station Stage stop on the Smokey Hill Trail."
- Old town site identified under alternative route C4 in Sec. 26 T18S R43W. Map 27.
- The Santa Fe Trail is a nationally known part of our heritage history.
- Joe R. Conrad – Historic ranches noted on Sheet 29.
- Dave Houston – noted on Sheet 25 location of bluffs, artifacts, mastodon tusks (sounds as if this was historic and these can no longer be found here).
- T4S R60W Sections 1 & 2. There are cultural resources sites all throughout this area. Teepee rings and other things.
- Domestic livestock grazing has been a traditional livelihood in El Paso and Pueblo counties since the late 1800s. The Frost and Hanna families have owned significant irrigated lands and water rights within the Fountain Creek watershed since the 1940s, a period now spanning four generations, making the ranch one of the most viable remaining ranching operations in the area.

Health and Safety

- John Thatcher – need to check ownership of chemical depot property; concern with how project would affect his lifestyle.
- Do you clean up if you quit using the lines?
- Health issues and future development plans [damaged].
- Secondly, are you aware that the proposed 500 kV transmission line will travel near or over our existing residence? If indeed, it is not proposed to travel over our existing residence but instead, near it, I am greatly concerned about the negative impact it will have on my family's health. I would like much more empirical data regarding the health risks these high voltage lines impose.
- Have concern about pulling wells as far as safety for drilling co. Check on OSHA requirements.
- What effect will T. line have on the metal water pipes that run from our place? Will I get shocked from hydrants?
- The main concern that I have with the voltage of these power lines is the health issues and what kind of impact they will have on the homes around them.
- I realize there is no absolute proof that high voltage power lines cause cancer; however, there is not proof that it does not.
- As a mother of small children I am concerned for their health.
- The greatest problem is the health considerations of the electricity on the residents.
- The first concern is the health impact from the power line on humans.
- It will destroy our view, ruin our property values, and create a serious health risk. This is not fair or reasonable.
- Power lines cause cancers (I'm in the health field).

Historic or Cultural

- The criteria developed by the Western Area Power Administration to evaluate potential locations for electrical transmission lines, as described in the January 2007 Transmission Project newsletter, unfairly discriminates against historic agricultural lands in favor of more recent residential developments and land uses.
- Frost Livestock owns 5,400 acres of deeded land and 18,000 acres of grazing rights on public land. The lands owned and leased by Frost Livestock are valuable and productive agricultural properties that form an integral part of Colorado's natural and cultural heritage.
- Alternative Route B13 crosses an old Native American campground with artifacts and fire pits on section 12-10S-40W.
- There are underground water lines from windmills to stock tanks.
- The Wray City water line diagonally across the land and it is marked. Be better if they contacted me or the city for location.

Historic or Cultural

- Future residential and/or commercial development [damaged].
- Health issues and future development plans [damaged].
- A portion of her land was going to be used for an additional house that is to be built in the near future. (T 8S - R 54W - Sec. 1 -4, T 7S - R 54W - Sec. 22, 23, 15) Will verify she is on the mailing list.
- We will [sic] in future.
- Cattle crossings? Use of property? Lease issues is there one?
- CRP in corridor.
- Future plans off of 125 Sub-Station.
- Planned racetrack north of Hugo (same folks as Bandimere) Maybe T10S, R54W NW part, need to check into this (call county).
- Lines as drawn cut through and across fields prefer along side of field.
- Farmland.
- My concern is "where the project will cross my property" if it does or not, and how it will effect [sic] any structures or not.
- Rental property being used as an office, resident, and carpentry construction.
- Property @ L Rd & Hwy 71.
- Issue: location of towers in relation to roads, section lines, adjacent easements.
- Where line is crossing or on the edge or a property or fence line, it would be better to off-set the Trline at least about 100' so farm equipment can circle around structures.
- Has farmland not currently occupied, but could be in summer months.

Land Use

- School was directly adjacent to original alternative corridor. Satisfied with move of segment C4 in T18S R43W, Map 27.
- [Kiowa County Commissioners & neighbors] Discussion of spray booms and tower location relative to section lines- general consensus is put towers as close as possible to lines- don't try to leave space between section line and towers to allow booms to pass- equipment is different and likely to change over time.
- On sheet map 12 Sect 15, T16S- R64W is their location.
- Would like to be contacted for discussions of structure placement on the property. Would like to maximize spans on the property.
- Has property on J4, Sheet map 12, T14S, R61W, S32, NE 1/4 of SE ¼.

Land Use

- This section is one of the few remaining areas of native land. The power lines would disrupt the natural beauty of the rolling hills GREATLY!
- This Ports to Plains had full funding and includes 16 toll roads projected- no one want that roadway project. Further east would be better.
- That alternative route on both sides of Hwy 36 just east of Byers affects many other existing homes or land in the process of being developed for home sites or planned to be in the near future & will definitely cause problems and dispute.
- Alternative Route L12 cuts across US Hwy 36 through section 36, Township 3 south, Range 61 west. Section 36 has been subdivided into 17-35+ acres sites. 14 of those sites is recorded with Adams county as Evergreen Country Estates- 6 of those 14 sites are either under contract or sold.
- It also passes too close to to [sic] many homes.
- On sheet map #2, in purple marker, "suggested reroute for study". Suggested re-route would cross far fewer landowners, would be avoiding population, would be crossing undeveloped land and land that has little potential to be developed (no water to support development) would simplify the route-fewer towers (corners).
- In current negotiations for wind farm.
- Conflict with existing easement for RES powerline (cedar point wind LLC).
- L13, L21, L23 is in an area of high development potential vs. the proposed L15 route.
- Also, oil tanks battery at SW corner of 31.
- Windmill for stock tanks right under your proposed routes.
- Washes on my property are CRP lands (about 100 acres).
- Could be sold for development (see attach survey plat).
- On route L9 in black marker is a shop, restaurant, house, motel.
- We are a non-profit org called PALS- People Animals Lives Saved. We helped people to restart their lives, learn farming taking care of animals, horses, dogs, cats, and to learn a trade: auto repair, remodeling, restaurant work, motel everything and anything.
- Its got rescued horses and show horses growing hay (grass).
- Horse rescue, grazing animals, hay growing.
- I am asking to see the evaluation made as to environmental justice, land use- residential, economic values and visual resources as to the effect on my home site that are planned for the N 1/2, S-31, T-1N, R-63W.
- Died of dedication.
- I live on the alternative route. If you do it will cut across my potential development land on section 12 & 13 on 112th and South. Hopefully you will be east of me.

Land Use

- I own SW1/4 Sec 10 2S 62.
- I plan on subdividing along Strasburg Road.
- in the future 2/12 (sic) sites.
- This power line is going through my property and this will cause a major devalue of this property since I will loose the use of much of my land.
- I will suffer the rest of the time I live here having to deal with the continuous problems of the power lines humming, popping and the static discharge from the lines, not to mention that I do not have full use of my land.
- It has been a good life out here. This life we have built is in jeopardy because of the route of the powerline project coupled with the siting of the buildings on our property.
- We own two adjacent parcels and the buildings stand close to the middle, along the property lines. This is exactly where the power line route is projected to run.
- It also presents a more immediate danger during construction. We are told the construction crew will be setting up trailers, excavating with heavy equipment, drilling anchoring holes, assembling the towers on site (here) and erecting them with cranes and helicopters.
- T14S, R61W, Sec 31, NE1/2 of N 1/2 of SE 1/4. SE 1/4 of NE ¼.
- They have worked alongside of my wife and I as we have improved the land, whether it was putting up fencing or stacking bales of hay.
- Section 14-22-35 is our farm headquarters. This land has two homes livestock facilities and grain storage.
- With this in mind, my wife and I are planning to build our "dream" home at this site. Any consideration on your behalf pertaining to tower sites should/must be taken into consideration. Our property address is: 3885 Mulberry Rd. Yoder, CO 80864.
- Also since we are the only public use airport in Cheyenne County, many other private and some commercial use airplanes come and go here using the hospital, nursing home, funeral home, county fair, emplement [sic] and other businesses.
- Privately owned public use airport SE4 14-14-44.
- I went to Fountain, CO last fall to see the route the line would take in relation to our property owned by the Koepke Family LLC in Arapahoe CO, (T4S R59W SE 1/4 sec. 6 South 1/2 sec. 5, north 1/2 sec. 8, sec. 7, and sec. 18) At that time it was going to be close but just off the SW corner of our section 18.
- We are studying uses for this land which could incorporate some or all of the above over the next few years.
- We are studying uses for our land over the next few years and this power line will greatly reduce the value of our land and make it almost impossible for development, farming and ranching, irrigation, conservation easement.

Land Use

- Also, the CRP contract means expensive grasses and restoration costs if CRP remains on some or all of this land.
- The CRP contracts are set to start expiring over the next 2 to 5 years so we probably will have to use the land for other purposes.
- We have a section and half of center pivot irrigation on 33-24-34 Terry Township; Finney County Ks. And 8-23-34 Finney County. There are well on 33-24-34, 21-21-34; 15-22-34.
- I have land in Kearny County 27-23-35 which has several gas wells.
- We have received information that the Western Area Power Administration (WAPA) is looking at putting in a transmission line in Colorado and Kansas. NRCS is a holder of several conservation easements in Colorado and Kansas.
- We have reviewed your website however cannot determine if any of our easements may be impacted by this pipeline. Do you have any shape files that are more specific than what you have on the web.
- Until recently we owned 1 1/2 sections of land southwest of Yoder, CO. The land has since been subdivided into 25 forty-acre units. All but 5 of these units have been sold, and we hope to sell the rest in the future.
- Mr. Agnew has land in the area, his mother received (possibly) the project mailer and he was wondering how the project would potentially effect the land they own. He requested a more detailed map. The land may be under his mother's name, Thelma Agnew.
- However we are even more concerned with the Colorado Natural Heritage Program, "Potential Conservation Areas" that encompass both the proposed and alternative corridors.
- Since we do not know what criteria, factors, or habitats are part of the "Potential Conservation Areas" we would encourage you to contact representatives from the Colorado Natural Heritage Program and get information on this area of their study in order to determine whether the proposed or alternative corridor has fewer constraints in the "Potential Conservation Area" be chosen as the preferred corridor.
- He referred me to two articles in "The Gazette", both from 1998 about the Bohart Ranch and Chico Basin. He thought that the articles could be obtained off the internet at Coloradosprings.com and Gazette.com, or CO-OL.com one article has an access number 209071 "preserving the high plains" 08/30/1998; associated with a reporter named "Pam Zubeck".
- According to Mr. Edmundson this is the biggest chunk of preserved ranch land in the US-- and it reminds him of being in places in Montana.
- We have a farmstead and some out buildings along CR 71 and our home base is along road 72 south of Plainview School.
- Route J5 where I'm located is mostly subdivided into forty acre parcels with a large number of homes, more are being built everyday.

Land Use

- The section directly north of section 2 is developed and there is some development south of section 2.
- I would prefer to not have powerlines around L12 and L14 because of the high possibility of development on our land.
- He also stated that he may have future plans on his land for another residence and he wanted to know how to convey that to the project personnel.
- He stated he would forward his concerns about the future residence that is planned on his land.
- My question involves my future plans to place a tree shelter belt around the perimeter of my land including section 20. Will this be affected if the J4 line goes over my land?
- Just want you to be aware I have horses grazing on my land. Currently I do not have a way of isolating them if there is to be any work on my property.
- Ms. Higgins left a message requesting that a better map be emailed to her for her property (7S, 54W and 8S.
- 54W). Also wanted to let us know that a house was going to be built on her son's property (NW 1/4 section 22, 7S, 54W).
- Our land is enrolled in Gov't CRP program. Would this project have any impact on the CRP program?
- Has proposed gravel mining operation along and under the crossing of Fountain Creek by the proposed Big Sandy to Midway 500kV line, T17S R65W Sections 14, 15, 23, 24.
- In T1S R63W 3 buildings identified within the one-mile wide corridor of segment M5. Map 1.
- "Sections 36 & 29 of T3S R61W on alternative route L12. Identification of subdivided residential land. Evergreen country estates. Six lots are sold. 354-acre development." Map 2.
- School identified near proposed route K9. Sec 14 T3S R55W. Map 4.
- Corral, old coal mine, home identified; Section 32, 33 T14S R60W near proposed J4 route. Map 11.
- McCurey property located on Rd 544 N of J4 proposed route in Section 34 T14S R60W. Map 11.
- Identification of property near proposed J13 and alternative J12 line in Sec. 15 & 22 T16S R64W. Map 12.
- Identification of tower near J11 proposed alternative in Sec. 5 T15S R63W. Map 12.
- Identification of proposed gravel LaFarge north of Wigwam, east of I-25 under proposed route 15 in Sections 24, 23, 14, 15, 10 T17S R65W. Map 13.
- Identification of possible gas lease just north of E6 in Section 22 T20S R52W. Map 17.
- Identification of state/leased land under proposed F4 in Sec. 36 T15S R50W. Map 20.
- Identification of cell tower southwest of proposed F3 route, Sec. 6 of T19S R46W. Map 25.

Land Use

- Identification of cell tower just west of alternative route C2 on K Rd., Sec. 20 of T19S R43W. Map 27.
- "—Potential gasoline identified diagonally across Sec. 25 T1S R45W under proposed H2.— Subdivided land identified east of proposed H2 in Sections 30 and 31 of T1S R44W on Rd AA." Map 28.
- Gas line and grassland identified near proposed H4 on 2 Rd, Sections 15 and 22 in T1N R45W. Map 28.
- Identification of conservation easement in Sections 2, 11, and 12 of T2S R44W under h3 alternative route. Map 28.
- Section 24 T4S R45W on proposed H2 re-draw to locate line on west side of Sec. 24 on State land. Map 29.
- Cemetery identified on Sec. 13 T4S R45W near proposed H2. Map 29.
- Identification of CRP land under proposed C7 route, Sec. 4 T9S R43W. Re-drawn C7 to be on west side of N-S line, running down Sec. 4; rejoins at proposed C5. Map 31.
- "Re-draw of proposed C5 line, Sections 24, 25, and 36 T9S R43W, along west and south section lines to avoid homesite, Sec. 36, and State land, Sec. 36 T9S R43W; rejoins original proposed in T10S R43W." Map 32.
- Gas well site identified in Sec. 6 T14S R42W, west of proposed C5. Map 33.
- Vacant property identified west of proposed C5, Sec. 30 T14S R42W. Map 33.
- High gas line identified under proposed C1 route, Sec. 17 T21S R42W. Map 36.
- Identification of proposed 50-100 MW wind farm and met tower (CVP) in Sec. 23-24 T10S R41W and Sec. 19 T10S R40W under B18. Map 37.
- Identification of sold property and quonset grain bins west of B14 proposed in Sec. 29 T15S R40W. Map 41.
- "T25S R35W Sec. 20, 21 — Tri-State line drawn T25S 33W Sec. 5, 8 — A1 re-draw further east by 1/2 mile T24S.
- R33W Sec. 17, 18 — Re-draw of B1 T24S R34W Sec. 24 — Proposed disposal site (B1) T23S R34W Sec. 19, 29, 30, 32 — Circled locations of oil wells, hay mill, and houses T24S R36W Sec. 32 — Re-draw and circled residences". Map 49.
- "T20S R59W Sec. 31-36 — Purple dashed line through these sections, "check ownership," (boundary of DOD land)." Map 51.
- Mr. Williams phoned in because he is in charge of a correctional facility that will be expanding and he was uncertain as to how the proposed line may affect their expansion. I informed him that if he could provide his property coordinates that we could send him an aerial map that would better show just how close the proposed route is to the property.

Land Use

- She wanted to know when and where the mtg. in Lakin, KS was and I shared that with her. The route does at this point does seem to cross some of her property and I ensured her that she would be added to the database, neither her nor myself could determine why she was not sent any information (Sections 13, 24, 25, 31 T17S R43W; Sections 27, 33, 34, 35 T19S R44W).
- Denver Metro Wastewater requested a more detailed map they have 5 2,000 acres east of Deer Trail and lease some land to a farmer, who received a scoping packet.
- Identified Hugh Scherrer's location and property ownership near alternative route J3, Sec. 16, T11S R58W. Map 10.
- I own land in Kit Carson County- sections 35, 26, 24 T11S R49W. 17, 18, 19, 20- T1S R48W.
- The plan for the line, just southeast of Limon affect a lot of state land. This line should run straight and not go diagonally.
- This project surrounds on two sides of one of our sections & though one of our 40 acre lot.
- On the existing line going across sec. 5, 8, 53 it would depend which side of it you go on whether it would be on us or not.
- 1S/62W/ Sec 10,11 are irrigated production agriculture.
- Sheet map 31 1) As C7 crosses I-70 south, line should remain on west half of sec. 4 as it is now CRP and not irrigation.
- Can this not be routed through adjacent grazing land or Fort Carson land that is not inhabited.
- Owl Canyon owns a parcel of land known locally as the Chico Feed Yard. The legal description for such real property can be found at reception number 300000010 in the Pueblo County Clerk and Records office and is legally described in the enclosed legal description. Such property shall be referred to hereafter as "Owl Canyon Property."
- This office has been engaged to represent numerous property owners with farms, residences, businesses, and property holdings along the proposed J4 electrical transmission line route from the Midway substation to the Big Sandy substation, part of the Eastern Plains Transmission Project.
- According to information furnished from your office, proposed route J4 would be within one half mile west from our property an could be placed closer.
- I am the managing General Partner of Schmisser Farms of Kansas, LP. Our family owns land in northwest Kearny County, Kansas, which would appear to be near the proposed A7 500kV line from Rolling Hills Substation to Energy Center Substation. Specifically we own land in sections 25, 26, 36 of Twp 21S, Range 38W and sections 4, 5, & 10 of Twp 22S, Range 38W. Will the proposed route touch any of our ground?
- Attached is the loan agreement on the property. The subject property is identified as Parcel B. Please advise as to any other information I can provide. James Berger.

Land Use

- I spoke with Rudy of Western earlier this morning regarding a large piece of property the Metro Wastewater Reclamation District owns near Deer Trail, CO. Could I please get a check on the legal descriptions listed below to see if any or part of the proposed transmission line will affect the Metro District's property?
- Sections 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 28, 33, & 34 T4S R58W; Sections 3, 4, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 28, 29, 32, 33, 34 & 35 T5S R58W; Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 13, 24 & 25 T6S R58W; Sections 1-36 T6S R57W; Sections 1 & 12, T7S, R58W; Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, & 7 T7S, R57W.
- Dale Johnson – T14SR40W, Section 32; not in favor of line cutting across pasture; prefers alternative on south and west (this still surrounds him on 3 sides with existing line on east); pasture has well and was previously irrigated – still has water rights and could re-install pivot; 2 pivots on ½ section to south; consider going on south side so he isn't surrounded (owner is Dwayne Frasier); also concern with CRP compliance (has 1/8 mile of cedar trees). Also owns land north of Holly near Energy Center (T21SR41W, Section 6 and S ½ Section 1, T21SR42W) – no problem with line crossing here.
- John Thatcher – need to check ownership of chemical depot property; concern with how project would affect his lifestyle.
- Dale Stull – property near Lamar, east of Fountain and north of Big Sandy; no specific comments (generally avoiding).
- Are you going to use guy wires on this line?
- Dalton Teague: I live in Cheyenne Wells. You can cross any land I own. Please let me know if you need to.
- Glenn Benjamin: T9S R60W Sections 2 and 11. State lease on Section 6, T9s R59W. I purchased this property on the northern end of the 125-mile substation site in the same auction as Tri-State purchased theirs. We did not know who was purchasing Tri-States property—it was done by a proxy. We did not know there would be an electrical line and substation running across the property we purchased.
- There is a planned Construction and Demolition Disposal Site. South of B1.
- There are 10-12 homes that you are going to impact.
- She has conservation work done on her property that was part of a government cost share-- we are going to destroy her efforts to return the property to pristine condition, it take 3-4 years or more to recover from construction impacts.
- We are not providing her with anything she needs. She has electricity as do her neighbors. What she needs is good telephone service, cable service.
- Does not want anyone on her property ever, for any purpose.
- Maximize the space between structures.

Land Use

- First of all, I don't understand why this route would not follow an existing road or trail as much as possible, considering the use of heavy equipment (cement trucks, etc.), for construction, and for future maintenance. It would be much less damaging for the whole area, now and long term.
- Why can't this be moved to more open areas along Hwy 71 and into open area that the land is open not populated with people?
- Kim Frey own property with building located on it such that the line would not be able to avoid the buildings.
- There is plenty of open space-- grazing land to the east which would be more appropriate for the t-line routing.
- There seems to be so much government open area on those maps. I wish you had access to more of that land.
- Alternate route K11 would also be more consistent with your stated desires of building along the shortest linear route, and following existing power lines.
- Alternate Route L1: Big Sandy to Green Valley: This 345 kV line would follow the existing 230 kV Tri-State line north of Limon and split at the south edge of our property, crossing on a diagonal through the heart of the F Cross Ranch (see enclosed map). We support Proposed route L2, which bypasses our property to the west.
- Requested that the line go directly North and South and East and West along section lines, not diagonally across the land. Diagonal crossing will interfere with his ability to use the land.
- Again, I do not want any towers on NW 1/4 3-21-40/ NE 1/4 3-21-40/ NE 1/4 4-21-40 NE 1/4 10-21-40.
- As an administrator of the school district impacted by the current projected path of the project, I am concerned that I will lose both staff and students who will move to avoid the power lines. We are the 16th smallest district in Colorado and very isolated. Students and quality staff are vital to the district. I believe the route should be re routed to a less populated area.
- Frost Livestock has labored vigorously for decades to maintain a large expanse of land intact with minimal fragmentation. The criteria used to evaluate alternatives should place the highest value on large areas of contiguous productive agricultural lands under common ownership because these lands are increasingly rare and valuable due to rampant development on surrounding properties.
- Southern Colorado's Front Range has a rapidly growing population that has created immense development pressures on open lands between Colorado Springs and Pueblo.
- To this end, it is expected that 900 acres of the Frost Livestock Ranch will be placed under a conservation easement held by Colorado Open Lands by May 2007. Although it is impossible to determine exactly where the transmission lines would be located because of the small scale of the maps provided, it appears that under every alternative the lines would pass close to lands under conservation easement and that at least portions would cross Colorado State Land Board Lands that have been designated for the Stewardship Trust established by Amendment 16 to the Colorado Constitution.

Land Use

- Financial compensation provided to landowners whose property is burdened with power lines is insufficient to mitigate the long-term deleterious [sic] effects to family-owned agricultural lands and the natural resources they support.
- In addition, Frost Livestock has a rich history of outstanding land stewardship, conservation management and sustainable ranching practices. With more than half of our nation's grasslands having been replaced by human landscapes, the diversity of biological communities can only be protected if the remaining large expanses of land encompassing functional ecosystems are preserved.
- These scoping comments for the Eastern Plains Transmission Project are submitted on behalf of Frost Livestock Co. ("Frost Livestock"), a Colorado family corporation formed on January 26, 1962 by Jon and Mary Frost. The principal business address for Frost Livestock Co. is 183530 Hanover Road, Pueblo, CO 81008. Frost Livestock owns private land that could be impacted by the Boone Substation to Midway Substation segment of the Transmission Project. Frost Livestock also leases public land for grazing purposes in the vicinity of the proposed transmission lines. Frost livestock strongly objects to the location of any electrical transmission lines or related facilities on its private property.
- Section 27 is the location of the proposed EPTP alternate power line route and switching station site (identified as M4). For the following reasons, you should choose M3 as the preferred route: 3. The alternate route on section 27 does not make good economic sense. The alternate route comes from the south, then doglegs one-half mile to the west, and then turns north again, right through the middle of section 27. This dogleg is purported to be due to a non-residential structure (small tank) on section 26. Yet, this dogleg runs adjacent to a tank, pump house and pit, not to mention an active oil well on the SE corner of section 27. Every turn increases the number of power poles on the property and increases EPTP costs dramatically. If the M4 alternate route is in fact selected, it would make more sense, economically, to minimize the length of the east-west dogleg (staying as close to the eastern property line as possible.) Not only would EPTP save the cost of wire for this 1/2 mile segment, it would reduce the impact on our farming operations.
- She is concerned with that size of a facility on her property because it will significantly impact her farming operation. She prefers that the facility not be on her property but that M3 or M5 be selected. She will send in comments as well.
- Why do the land owners who keep their land free of clutter i.e. no trailer parks, junk yards, etc, get to be rewarded with your giant power line?
- These areas that you proposed to put the transmission power lines are my livelihood for both my hunting preserve and my hay and cattle business. The hay that is planted in the circles irrigation provides financial income for my family and feed for my own cattle and the stubble that is left after cutting is for my hunting preserve.
- I own a hunting preserve that is located in the proposed area and or alternate area.

Land Use

- I am concerned that your EPTP analysis did not find out more about the land use by us and other in this area. Steel Fork Pheasants, LLC has been a state park for almost six years now and your analysts should have been more thorough in the study of land use.
- I have also heard that the power lines cannot be installed on the Bohart Ranch because it is State or protected property, however there is already a aircraft landing strip and other 75 foot transmission lines going through that property.
- Is this an attempt not to cut across the Bohart Ranch? At what block number does this jog occur and can the transmission lines continue to run parallel on the South side of Sanborn Rd. through the Bohart Ranch?
- No matter what payment is received for "damages" the value of the land will forever be reduced.
- I own 5.6 acres of land which is vacant at this time. My husband passed away before plans could be completed. The property is located at 6625 Sweetwater Pl. Legal description is lot 40 Pioneer Village Rd. Nol. Schedule 3 57070-04-029.
- Perhaps a little zoning and fewer trashed up trailers using electricity would be the answer to avoid this obstruction.
- Have you considered actually utilizing present roads as part of the easement instead of intruding into privately owned property?
- In this area you have 9 residences near this line. Looking at your maps J4 does not impact that many residences.
- The current route also shows it to cross some of our field strips perpendicular to the direction of the strips, is it possible to have the transmission line run parallel to the field of strips?
- The Metro District land applies biosolids to certain fields within the METROGRO Farm at any given time. It is not necessarily the typical seasonal type farming operation throughout the year. There could also be any number of special projects taking place on the Farm at any given time, such as road projects, conservation projects, on-going research projects, chemical spraying, etc.
- Yes very special uses and circumstances which are medically documented ones. The 302nd air wing at Peterson.
- Air Force Base even avoid it in their practice maneuvers due to her condition. My land is used for the residence of this special medical patient.
- I own land in Arapahoe County that is in the path of the proposed routes. The schedule number for my land is 1989-00-0-00-149. This is a 35 acre parcel, roughly square, which was farmed until 2003. The southeast corner of my land is the intersection of County Road 241 and County Road 18.
- Please be advised that the subject property located in the SE 1/4 section 23-11-41W in Wallace County, Kansas is subject to an existing conservation easement granted to the United States. The easement is a Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP) interest authorized by Title 16 USC 3837, et. Seq. and implemented by the Code of Federal Regulations at 7 CFR 1467. The Natural Resources and Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture is the administering agency. Because the United States is the true party in interest, it is exempt from legal process pursuant to the doctrine of sovereign immunity.

Land Use

- Mr. Thurlow phoned because he was concerned that the transmission line may affect conservation easements they have in Colorado and Western Kansas. He provided the legal description of one of the properties in question (Section 23, T11S, R41W) and asked that I email him an aerial map of that section so that he could better determine if the line may affect their easement. He also asked about shape file and I told him I would have to look into if we have any that we could send out. He said that the aerial map should be sufficient.
- We own two parcels: 640 acres at 68851 East 88th avenue to the south, Calhoun-Byers Road to the west, 96th avenue to the north, and ground owner by another farmer adjacent to us on the east. 320 Acres at 8808 Behrens.
- Mile Road, with Behrens Mile Road to the West, and ground owned by other farmers on the north, east, and south.
- An additional concern, and other questions, relate to our own electrical provider. Undoubtedly IREA also will need to upgrade their carrying capacity in the near future. Will your placements preclude IREA from having access to the most efficient siting for their lines?
- If you both need towers in the same areas, will that end up doubling the number of towers and lines we have to view and make room for?
- Why do your towers need to be in the open spaces we so value instead of following the roadways that already connect the various substations you are serving?
- Damage to Environment.
- We are part of the "State of Colorado" state tax payers, both on income and property yet you say you can't go through state land where nothing but cattle graze, no homes are on this land.
- Our area and surrounding adjacent areas are rapidly growing rural development. 3-5 years ago this are just boomed and has been platted to grow even more.
- My husband's ashes are scattered on the land.
- My land, W2 SE4 Sec. 17; SE4 Sec 18, T11S R56W 6th PM, (240 acres) is contract Farm 0436 under USDA Conservation Program. Under the terms of the contract no vehicle traffic is allowed on the property, for any issue involving surface use we would feel compelled to involve: US Dept of Agriculture, Farm Service Agency, PO Box 97, Hugo, CO 80821, 719-743-2408.
- We have contracted with NRCS to build terraces to control soil erosion on our land lord's property along the Kiowa county line road SE 1/4 34-20-44, SW 1/4 35-20-44, SW 1/4 34-20-44, and SE 1/4 33-20-44.
- What about if this removes the landowner from the government programs and calls for a pay back like CRP?

Land Use

- Nearly ten (10) years ago I purchased cattle ranching land at a premium price with hopes of someday developing the land into 35 to 5 acre tracts.
- I did speak with Mr. Howard again on 3/14 and explained the jog in J4 at that point was to avoid crossing the state stewardship lands. As currently drawn, the route skirted the state land to join with the existing right of way and then cross the state land parallel to that right of way, based on state's requirements.
- We want single poles vs. towers that are projected because: farming easier around pole vs. tower, not as much waste and land needed for production to feed our county, weed control will be eliminated by you under a tower.
- Big Sandy to Green Valley: L2 needs to be located next to and parallel to K1 with both being on the west side of the existing line from Big Sandy to Beaver Creek until it almost (sic) the Washington-Lincoln county line and then follow L1 to the west until it become L3, This option avoids the Western Union tower located in sec 2 6S 56W, Less farmland would be impacted with this route rather than the proposed L2 route.
- The second suggested route. Following down J4 from Limon and then across to the Mid-way station. Would also have the same benefits. Although it would entail it going across approximately just 2 miles of state land. Along, above, or below Myers road out of the Edison area.
- All of that area above Ordway is large open section of grass on very large ranches. Hardly a house near the highway. Especially on the eastern side.
- "Identification of homesite Sec. 21 T12S R52W re-draw of proposed F7 in Section 1 of T13S R52W, continuing to travel north into Section 36 of T12S R52W and then running parallel to F7 approximately 1 mile north and east; visual re-draw runs behind house. Map 19.
- "—Identification of property boundary and homesite S6 T15S R50W, just north of proposed F7.— Re-draw of F7 to run 1/2 mile south of proposed original through T15S R50W and T15S R51W, T14S R51W in Sec. 21 T15S R50W; it turns east and rejoins original F4 proposed in Sec. 27 T15S R50W (stay south of PL)" Map 20.
- "10S R59W Sec. 26 — Marked home in red (was not visible)". Map 8.
- Map 35- T17S R43W Sec. 25, 35, 36, 10, T18S R43W- Sec 1 & 2, 11, T16S R 43W Sec. 12.
- Identification of Sarah Klann trust property in Sec. 8 T8S R52W, south of proposed G4 route. Map 21.
- Identification of Penny Ranch properties, including 2 homesites and feed lots in Sections 20 and 21 T9S R43W, near alternative C6. They prefer proposed C5 route. Map 31.
- Prefer (pro) C5 and do not want C2, C4 (alts) because of locations of Penny Ranch homes and feed lots, Sections 20 and 21 T9S R43W. Map 31.

Land Use

- Re-draw of H2 proposed to avoid Richer's homesite and center pivots Sections 25 and 36 T4S R45W from 8 Rd proposed route; will jog either west or east, running down section lines until it rejoins original proposed H2 and A Rd, where it again is redrawn to avoid center pivot on NW1/4, SW corner, then rejoins proposed H2. Map 29.
- Re-draw of proposed A9 route starting at NW corner, Sec 36 T21S R42W: 1. Running NW diagonally across sec. 26 and then due west along existing 345KV to EC substation and 2. Running SW diagonally across Sec. 35, then due west along Township line between T21S and T22S until it meets alt A8 and into EC to avoid house (sec. 34 T21S R42W). Map 36.
- "Identification of homesite directly under proposed A7 route/Sec. 34 T21S R41W; alternative drawn. 1. Sec. 26 T21S R42W line jogs NW diagonally to 1/2 mile north of south Section line (Sec. 27) and then turns due west through Sections 27, 29, and 29 to Energy Center." Map 36.
- "Identification of homesite directly under proposed A7 route/Sec. 34 T21S R41W; alternative drawn.1. Sec. 26 T21S R42W line jogs NW diagonally to 1/2 mile north of south Section line (Sec. 27) and then turns due west through Sections 27, 29, and 29 to Energy Center." Map 36.
- 15-8-54/ 8-8-54.
- "3N 56W Sec. 24 — Raptor nest (1/2 mile from corridor)" Map 3.
- T2N R55W Sec 17, 18, 19, 20 proposed Unocal project identified including storage site, line near alt. K-11, 36" pipeline in Sec. 5 T2N R55W. Map 3.
- T2N R55W Sec 17, 18, 19, 20 proposed Unocal project identified including storage site, line near alt. K-11, 36" pipeline in Sec. 5 T2N R55W. Map 3.

Map Comments

- Re-draw of proposed B14 route to avoid home/farm in Sec. 36 T11S R41W line; jogs SE diagonally 1/2 mile through Sec. 36, then due south into Sec. 1 T12S R41W, where it rejoins B14. Map 37.
- "T25S R36W Sec. 23, 25, 36 — Circled 3 houses along proposed route". Map 49.
- Line B7, Terrace Farming & Aerial Spraying along B7. Prefers B7 and not B6 or not drawn/re-draw. Map 47.
- "T21S R37W, B9Re-draw of B9 to follow roads and Section lines." Map 46.
- Has plans to build 3/4 circle center pivot (drawn on map).
- Drew several re-route possibilities (In Red on map).
- "T25S R36W Sec. 12, 13 — Scratched out A1 because he prefers A2, the proposed route." Map 49.
- "T22S R38W Sketched property line; does not like A4 or A7. Prefers A6." Map 46.

Map Comments

- "T21S R35W, Line B7Sec. 5, 9, 10, 15, 25 — Re-draw; does not want line through grassland because cattle and grazing concerns; re-draw line through farming area." Map 47.
- Plainview School identified near segment C4 in Sec. 27 in T18S R43W on 71 Rd. Map 27.
- Three alternative runways identified in Sec. 19 T21S R43W, Sec. 24 T21S R44W, and Sec. 1 T22S R44W near proposed D2 and D3 and alternative D4, respectively. Map 36.
- Along proposed J4 route T11S R56W Sec. 3, home and buildings were identified. Map 9.
- Note: SC-100 is wrong; legals don't match up with map.
- "—Re-draw of segment C5 in Sections 12, 13, 14, and 25 to run along section line/range line between.
- R43W/42W—Identification of 10 grain bins, 3 homes in Sec. 25 and grain bins in Sec. 26 of T18S R43W." Map 27.
- J4, map 12, T14S, R61W, Sec. 31.
- Sec 31 T14S R61W SE 1/4, SW 1/4.
- "—Identification of Air Force Academy auxiliary runway in Sec. 11 T15S R62W.—Identification of homes/buildings in Sec. 31 & 32 T14S R61W and Sec. 6 T15S R61W.—Possible re-draw to take line J4 proposed route approximately 2 miles south along range line between R62W and R61W, then runs due east in Sec. 7 T15S R61W through vacant land (ends before it runs off map???)". Map 12.
- "—Re-draw of J10 proposed and J7 alternative to avoid home site in Sec. 33 T14S R62W.—Re-draw of J7 at NW corner of Sec. 26 T14S R62W; runs south to meet up with proposed J8 in Sec. 34 T14S R62W, then due west at Township line between T14/15S. It runs along this line approximately 2 miles where it then runs approximately 1 mile south and east of original J9-J7 alternative line." Map 12.
- Identification of farm, horse pastures, old center pivot, new home, and vacant home in Sections 30, 31, and 32 T14S R40W and Sec. 35 T14S R41W. Map 39.
- On sheet map 2, in blue and red pen, his property is marked T45 R60W.
- "L10, L11 T45S R60WSW1/4, Sec. 23. 100-year family homestead. Sec. 18 (2x) — registered historic buildings. Sec. 15 (1x) — registered historic building Sec. 22 — Price Peter old school". Map 2.
- "—Section 20 T4S R58W. Re-draw on L5 to E & N of proposed route to avoid sandy soils.— Proposed route L9 L15 L8 to follow suggested re-draw N & E on township line between T2S-3S, and south on range line between R58-R59; it rejoins original route at L5." Map 2.
- On map #2 in blue marker is their location, 945 SCR 185.
- Proposed L22 Route re-draw 1 mile S @ T1S R61W Sec. 18 to 15, then rejoins L-17. Map 1.
- On map #1 in red pen, 6WS Sec 8,9,17,16 is location.

Map Comments

- T2S R60W Sec 31, 32 is location.
- T6S R57W is the location.
- "L10 T45S R60W Sec. 17 — Re-drew line due to horses and grazing and other concerns" Map 2.
- Map #2 2054 S. Quail Hollow Rd, Byers, CO 80103 is location.
- On map 1 N 1/2, S-31, T-1N, R-63W.
- Oil wells, water wells, home site, and future stock and development sites are identified in Sections 12 & 13 Range, but is not within project area. Map 1.
- Map #1, in purple pen, R213, Range TS 62 W.
- At the Lakin meeting, one of your representatives, Larry drew on map 47 this alternative route across the grassland. You would be able to start at section 12-21-36 and follow a draw that angles across section 18, 17, 16, 15, and 22 all in townships 21, R35.
- We pointed out the location of 8-10 houses in our neighborhood that were not already indicated on your map- they were marked by your staff members.
- Sec., Township, Range: E2 10, 11S, 42W; N2 15, 11S, 42W; N2 23, 11S, 42W; 13, 11S, 42W.
- Sections 15, 28, 16, 21, T11S R42W, Sec 25, T21S, R42W.
- Sec SE 18, SE/SW 18, 19 NW20, SW30, S2/SE 30, NWNW 31, SWNW 31, NW/SE 30, T4S, R55W.
- On map 9 or 10, It contains 12S 57W section 20 farmland, marked farmland.
- Segment M4 re-draw to east of Erie Tap T1N R64W Sec. 28, 29 then rejoins M4 route. Re-draw to avoid cropland. Map 1.
- In T1S R63W 3 buildings identified within the one-mile wide corridor of segment M5. Map 1.
- Proposed L17 and L15 route segment to run on the west side of Rd 246 in Sections 14, 15, 22, and 23. Map 1.
- "—Section 23, 22 of T2S R61W proposed L15 on W side of road 246 because location of center pivot irrigation and a home site.\ —L9 and L15 redraw 1/2 mile south in Section 31 T2S R60W because of location of windmill for stock tank, wildlife pond, and hunting club." Map 2.
- "Sections 36 & 29 of T3S R61W on alternative route L12. Identification of subdivided residential land. Evergreen country estates. Six lots are sold. 354-acre development." Map 2.
- Confirm location of the Beaver Creek Substation SE of Brush is in correct location on sheet map #3.
- "T2N R55W Sec. 6 — Two structures identified (in purple) in K-11" Map 3.
- On proposed segment k10 identified possible floodplain of the sand creek. Must check with FEMA. Possible re-draw 1 mile to east or west. Map 4.
- School identified near proposed route K9. Sec 14 T3S R55W. Map 4.

Map Comments

- "T7S R56W Sec. 25, 26 — Grain bins drawn (in purple) along L1". Map 7.
- "T7S R56W Sec. 27 — L1, grain bins Sec. 29 — (L2) Lester Malcom house Sec. 28, 29 — (L2) Two more structures labeled "Malcom". Map 7.
- Redraw of alternative route G3 to avoid runway running N-S T7S R54W sec 19 & 20. Map 7.
- Re-draw of K5 proposed route slightly west to avoid dryland farming (wheat, feed) T6S R56W Sec. 22 & 23. Map 7.
- "T1S R56W NE1/4 Sec. 34 — Grain bins/shop drawn (purple)". Map 7.
- "T9S R60W, Sec. 11, 12 — Red re-draw 1/2 mile east of N5, Sec. 12 — House drawn". Map 8.
- New home site and property identified on alternatives J1 & N4 on south side of I-70 T9S R57W Sec. 10, SW 1/4. Map 8.
- House identified north of alternate route J3 T10S R57W Sec. 11. Map 8.
- Windmill identified near alternative N3 and north side of I-70 T9S R57W Sec. 4. Map 8.
- Windmill for stock watering identified near N1 and N2 Sec. 29, T8S R57W. Map 8.
- "Identified center pivot irrigation circle near alternative route N4. T9S R58W Sec. 22, Re-draw of alternative approximately 1/2 mile N into 125-mile substation." Map 8.
- Sec 21, T11S R56W marshy land identified near proposed J4 route. Map 9.
- "Re-draw of proposed segment J4 starting T11S R56W Sec. 21 to the east, then north with several jogs east and west until it rejoins original J4 at Sec. 34 T9S R56W." Map 9.
- An area of steep hills and wet ground were identified as well as farmland near proposed J4 route Sec. 21 T11S R56W. Map 9.
- Identification of quonset bin along F8 alt route as well as sand hills, sandy soils in Sections 3 and 4 T11S R55W. Map 9.
- Re-draw on proposed F10 route @ Section 26 on the south and west Section lines T9S R55W. Map 9.
- "Identified locations along the proposed F7 route including Section line, dam in seven mile creek, house, corrals, and steel shed in Sections 7 & 8 T11S R53W." Map 9.
- "Re-draw of proposed J4 route to the east along township line between T13S and T14S, then north along Section line between Sections 32 and 33 into Section 29 where it rejoins original proposed J4 in T13S R58W." Map 10.
- Identification of well with solar tank and Yaklich RI/TVI/AN ground clearance, and farm in Sections 18, 19, and 20 of T12S R57W. Map 10.
- Airport runway in Section 11 T15S R62W. Map 11.

Map Comments

- "Re-draw of J-10 route from Sec. 35 of T14S R62W east to 85 Rd in Sec. 36 T14S R62W, then south along Range line between R62W-R61W, then runs east to Boone Rd or Rd 575 and north until it rejoins J4 in Sec. 3 T14S R60W to avoid many homes that were marked." Map 11.
- "—Re-draw of alternative J5 starting Sec. 8 T14S R61W and running east until it meets 575 Rd. in Sec. 12 T14S R61W, then it splits into two re-drawn alternative 1.—Runs north adjacent to 575 Rd and rejoins original J5 route Sec. 18 T13S R60W, and option 2. continues east past 575 Rd with several jogs north and south until meeting alternative J4 in Sec. 1 of T14S R59W." Map 11.
- "—Many homes identified to be an issue beneath alternative J5 route in subdivided Sections 23, 26, and 25 of T13S R61W.—Airport location identified along alternative route J5 Section 18 T13S R60W." Map 11.
- Airport location identified south of re-draw alternative route in Section 17 T14S R60W. Map 11.
- 8 homes identified near proposed J4 Section 31/32 of T14S R61W. Map 11.
- Corral, old coal mine, home identified; Section 32, 33 T14S R60W near proposed J4 route. Map 11.
- McCurey property located on Rd 544 N of J4 proposed route in Section 34 T14S R60W. Map 11.
- Re-draw of J4 proposed route starting Sec. 34 T14S R59W continues to run east approximately 2 miles; turns north (due N) in Sec. 36 T14S R59W and runs north until meeting original J4 route (proposed) in Sec. 13 T14S R59W. Reason: possible sprinkler circle in Sec. 23 T14S R59W. Map 11.
- Re-draw of J4 route on Elbert/Lincoln Co. line in Sec. 31 & 32 T13S R58W; turns due east along county line and then due north up Section line on east side of 32 & 29. It rejoins original J4 route in Sec. 28 & 29 of T13S R58W "triple crown." Map 11.
- Identification of property near proposed J13 and alternative J12 line in Sec. 15 & 22 T16S R64W. Map 12.
- Identification of tower near J11 proposed alternative in Sec. 5 T15S R63W. Map 12.
- Barn & windmill identified under J10 proposed route in Sec. 23 T15S R63W. Map 12.
- Identification of wetland area under J10 proposed route, Sec. 19 T15S R62W. Map 12.
- Identification of proposed gravel LaFarge north of Wigwam, east of I-25 under proposed route 15 in Sections 24, 23, 14, 15, 10 T17S R65W. Map 13.
- "—Railroad routes drawn in north half of T19S R62W and south half of T18S R62W.—12 proposed close to line/railroad in Sec. 27 and 28 T19S R63W." Map 14.
- Identification of alternative site for Boone substation just NE of proposed site in Sec. 4 T21S R61W. Map 15.
- Identification of home sites/buildings south of proposed E6 in Sections 29 and 30 of T20S R54W. Map 16.
- Identification of possible gas lease just north of E6 in Section 22 T20S R52W. Map 17.

Map Comments

- Identification of potential access point Sec. 17 T12S R52W for proposed F7 route. Map 19.
- Identification of Cage house/property Sections 34 and 35 T14S R52W near F5 alternative. Map 20.
- Re-draw to connect proposed F4 & F5 in Sec. 12 T14S R52W and south of diagonal through Sections 1 and 12.
- T15S R52W, where it rejoins alternative F5 along the Lincoln/Cheyenne County road in Sec. 12 T15S R52W. Map 20.
- Two homesites identified in Sections 1 and 3 T16S R50W near alternative F5 route. Map 20.
- Identification of state/leased land under proposed F4 in Sec. 36 T15S R50W. Map 20.
- Re-draw of alternative G3 in Sec. 19 T7S R53W; it will run south, east from original and rejoin approximately 1 mile away (alt. G3). Map 21.
- "Re-draw of proposed G4 route starting in Sections 4 and 5 T8S R53W at Rd 3, running along existing 230kV line to Section line between 4 & 9, then due east, still following existing 230 kV line, until it rejoins proposed G4 in Sec. 11 T8S R53W." Map 21.
- Identification of dryland ag., CRP land and pasture north of proposed G4 route, Sections 10, 11, and 12 T8S R52W and dryland farm south of G4, Sections 10, 11, and 12 T8S R52W. Map 21.
- Identification of 3 Rivers Ranch leased by Mike Klann and A&D Farms, Sections 7 and 18 T8S R51W under proposed G4 and existing 230 kV line. Map 21.
- "—Identification of Witt property, Sec. 17 T8S R51W, south of the proposed G4 route.— Identification of Witt property feed lot and homesite under alternative route G3, Sections 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21 of T7S R50W." Map 22.
- "—Identification of two homesites in Sections 15 and 16 of T8S R49W just north of proposed G4 route.—Identification of solar water well in Sec. 16 T8S R49W under proposed G4 route." Map 22.
- B. Rueb new homesite identification. 23505 CR 4, Vona, CO 80861 in Sec. 14 of T8S R48W just south of proposed G4 route. Map 23.
- Identification of homesite, Sec. 16 of T8S R46W; Y.00 Rd and 33.00 Rd. south of proposed route. Map 23.
- Identification of cell tower southwest of proposed F3 route, Sec. 6 of T19S R46W. Map 25.
- Well identified under proposed E1 route, Sec. 9 T21S R45W Map 26.
- Hanger/air strip identified north of proposed D2 route in Sec. 23 T21 R45W. Map 26.
- "—Re-draw of proposed D2 route, Sections 19 and 20 in T21S R45W and Sec. 24 in T21S R46W to turn due south in Sec. 20 and due west when it intersects 55.00 Rd until it runs into D2 line, which used to be D1 line, and into Lamar Substation.—Re-draw of alternative D1 to run, 1/4 mile west of original D1 (now D2) and 1/4 mile south of D2 when it turns east and rejoins original route in Sec. 30 T21S R45W." Map 26.

Map Comments

- Old town site identified under alternative route C4 in Sec. 26 T18S R43W. Map 27.
- Identification of cell tower just west of alternative route C2 on K Rd., Sec. 20 of T19S R43W. Map 27.
- Identification of homesite on 72 Rd. between proposed C5 and alternative C4 in Sec. 24 T19S R43W. Map 27.
- Re-draw of proposed H2 route moved approximately 2.5 miles west of original to run on X Rd. north up the middle of T2S and T1S R45W, and turns due east around 30 Rd on township line between T1N and T1S R45W; rejoins original H2/H4 route in Sec. 35 T1N R45W. Map 28.
- Two homes identified on AA Rd in Sec. 1 T2S R45W and identification of new homesite in Sec. 1 T2S R45W. Map 28.
- "—Potential gasoline identified diagonally across Sec. 25 T1S R45W under proposed H2.— Subdivided land identified east of proposed H2 in Sections 30 and 31 of T1S R44W on Rd AA." Map 28.
- Gas line and grassland identified near proposed H4 on 2 Rd, Sections 15 and 22 in T1N R45W. Map 28.
- Sunnyville heights identified north of H4 proposed in Sec. 31 T2N R44W. Map 28.
- Re-draw of alternative route H3 in Sections 35 and 36 in T1S R44W. At NW corner of Sec. 36 and NE corner of 35, H3 runs west along 25 Rd and south through middle of Section 25 through township line between T1S-T2S and rejoins original H3 alternative in Sec. 2 of T2S R44W. To avoid cultivated land in Sec. 35, T1S R44W and center pivots in Sections 1 and 2 in T2S R44W. Map 28.
- Identification of conservation easement in Sections 2, 11, and 12 of T2S R44W under h3 alternative route. Map 28.
- Section 24 T4S R45W on proposed H2 re-draw to locate line on west side of Sec. 24 on State land. Map 29.
- Cemetery identified on Sec. 13 T4S R45W near proposed H2. Map 29.
- Homesites identified on AA Rd, Sec. 12 T4S R45W and Sec. 1 T4S R45W, east of proposed H2. Map 29.
- Identification of Wine Glass homesite 1871-5 in Sec. 25 T3S R45W; Fox Ranch to west of proposed H2, and McCoy Ranch to east of H2. Map 29.
- Identification of vacant corrals and wind breaks in Sec. 25 T2S R45W near proposed H2. Map 29.
- Re-draw of H2 proposed route to branch west off proposed H2 at Rd 6 and Township line between T4S and T5S. It turns 90 degrees due north at the section line between Sections 33 and 34 in T4S R45W, and runs due north through T2S R45W. Map 29.

Map Comments

- Re-draw of proposed H2 to avoid center pivots and homesite in Sections 25 and 36 of T4S R45W to run 1/2 mile east of proposed down the range line between R45W and R44W to 1/2 mile into Sec. 1 T5S R45W, then runs diagonally south of proposed H2 in Sections 6, 7 and 8 in T5S R44W until it meets original proposed H2 around 4 Rd and CC Rd in Sec. 17 T5S R44W and continues south. Map 30.
- Building and house identified in Sec. 35 T4S R45W. Map 30.
- Identification of 3 homesites/buildings under alternative G5 in Sec. 36 T8S R45W and Sec. 1 T9S R45W. Map 31.
- Identification of crop/grassland under alt. G5, Sec. 1 T9S R45W. Map 31.
- "—Identification of pivot in Sec. 15 T8S R43W; prefer proposed B21 to go on north side of Y.00 Rd in Sections 14.
- and 15 T8S R43W.—Identification of feed lot (Section 13), and irrigation well (Section 24), T8S R43W.—Re-draw of proposed B21 route to follow north and east borders of Sec. 24 T8S R43W instead of bisecting." Map 31.
- Identification of CRP land under proposed C7 route, Sec. 4 T9S R43W. Re-drawn C7 to be on west side of N-S line, running down Sec. 4; rejoins at proposed C5. Map 31.
- Identification of 3 homesites, Sections 17, 20, and 21 T9S R43W, under alt. C6-C2. "Do not want these alts." -- written by alt. C4. Map 31.
- "Re-draw of proposed C5 route on west section line of Sec. 12 T9S R43W, continuing south on section lines and turning diagonally east 1/2 mile into Sec. 36 and then rejoins proposed C5 around southern section line of Sec. 36." Map 31.
- Identification of homes in Sec. 19 T9S R42W and Sec. 35 T9S R43W, near proposed C5 line. Map 31.
- "Re-draw of proposed C5 line, Sections 24, 25, and 36 T9S R43W, along west and south section lines to avoid homesite, Sec. 36, and State land, Sec. 36 T9S R43W; rejoins original proposed in T10S R43W." Map 32.
- "—Identification of center pivot circles, Sections 1, 12, 13, 24, and 25, and grain bins in Sec. 25 T10S R43W.—Re-draw of proposed C5 in Sec. 25 jobs west 1/2 mile around grain bins, south through Sec. 36, and jobs east to rejoin proposed C5 in Sec. 36 T10S R43W. —Re-draw line runs to east of Range line, Sections 6, 7 and 18 T10S R42W and west of Range line, Sections 24, 25, and 36 T10S R43W." Map 32.
- Homesite identified east of alt. C2, Sec. 18 T14S R43W. Map 33.
- Homesites identified near proposed C5, Sec. 7 T13S R42W and Sec. 20 T13S R42W. Map 33.
- Gas well site identified in Sec. 6 T14S R42W, west of proposed C5. Map 33.
- Vacant property identified west of proposed C5, Sec. 30 T14S R42W. Map 33.

Map Comments

- Re-draw of proposed C5 line in Sec. 7 T15S R42W to run south down east Section line, avoiding farmed land, then jogs west of Sec. 18 and rejoins C5. Map 33.
- Re-draw of proposed F1 route in Sections 2, 3, and 10 T21S R43W. Section 2 is grazing to cultivated land. Re-draw runs south on Section line, west on Section line (Sec. 2), and south down 29.00 Rd into Sec. 23, where it cuts diagonally NW to SE into the Energy Center substation. They prefer single pole. Map 36.
- Identification of water Assn Tank under alt. D4 in Sec. 3 T22S R43W. Map 36.
- High gas line identified under proposed C1 route, Sec. 17 T21S R42W. Map 36.
- Identified property near A8 alt., Sec. 6 T22S R41W and Sec. 1 T22S R42W. Map 36.
- Re-draw of B18 in Sec. 19 T10S R40W, running just SW of proposed, to meet B20 in Sec. 34 T9S R41W. Map 37.
- Identification of proposed 50-100 MW wind farm and met tower (CVP) in Sec. 23-24 T10S R41W and Sec. 19 T10S R40W under B18. Map 37.
- Identification of farm and soil bank in Sections 12 and 13 T10S R41W under proposed B18. Map 37.
- Homesites and property boundaries identified near alt. B13 in Sections 7, 18, and 19 of T13S R36W; prefer to move line west 2.5 miles—no re-draw. Map 40.
- Identification of sold property and quonset grain bins west of B14 proposed in Sec. 29 T15S R40W. Map 41.
- Re-draw of proposed B14 to run approximately 1 mile west of original for all of T15S R40W; runs south to County line, then east on Co. line to meet proposed B14 in Sec. 4 T16S R40W. Map 41.
- Re-draw of B10 and B12 alt. B12, in Sec. 3. Will continue east, bisecting Sec. 2 N-S, then cuts diagonally from W to SE corner and rejoins segment B10 in Sec. 12 (all in) T17S R37W. Map 42.
- Identified Pauline Fecht's property and unoccupied home near proposed B11 in Sections 27 and 28 in T18S R40W. Map 43.
- Re-draw of alt. route B10 running south. Beginning of Sec. 17 T18S R36W line will jog due east 1/2 mile and due south along CR15 and Section lines on east side of Sections 17, 20, 29, and 32 T18S R36W and Sections 5 and 8 T19S R36W. In Sec. 8, 1/2 mile south of north Section line, it jogs due west and rejoins original proposed B10. Map 44.
- Re-draw of alt. A6 was moved 1/2 mile north in Sec. 17 T22S R40W and runs due east. Map 45.
- "Proposed B11 re-drawn in Sec. 9 T21S R40W to continue south one mile and then due east around west and south Section lines on Sec. 9. It follows previous B11 route." Map 45.
- T21S R38W, Sec. 31-36, is this a road? Check. Map 46.
- "T22S 37W Sec. 16-18 T22S 38W Sec. 13 - ?? — Re-draw of A-6 1/2 mile north". Map 46.
- Sec. 4 — New center pivot ag. Drawn Map 49.

Map Comments

- Sec. 6, 7, 16 — Re-drew line (A2) to be further west; 3 houses in Section 16 Map 49.
- "T25S R36W Sec. 31, 32 — Houses drawn Sec. 32 — NW corner, "check previous maps". Map 49.
- "T25S R35W Sec. 20, 21 — Tri-State line drawn T25S 33W Sec. 5, 8 — A1 re-draw further east by 1/2 mile T24S R33W Sec. 17, 18 — Re-draw of B1 T24S R34W Sec. 24 — Proposed disposal site (B1) T23S R34W Sec. 19, 29, 30, 32 — Circled locations of oil wells, hay mill, and houses T24S R36W Sec. 32 — Re-draw and circled residences". Map 49.
- "T20S R59W Sec. 31-36 — Purple dashed line through these sections, ""check ownership,"" (boundary of DOD land)." Map 51.
- Identified all property owned by Steve Newsom. Outlined in blue under proposed route k10 in T2N R55W Sec. 35, and T1N R55W Sec 1,2,11, 12. Map 3.
- 61461 St. Rd. 71 identified homesite near alternatives G6 and K2 T7S R55W Sec. 28 (Rd 27 and 3S Rd). Map 7.
- Identified Hugh Scherrer's location and property ownership near alternative route J3, Sec. 16, T11S R58W. Map 10.
- Re-draw of proposed C5 route in Sec. 18 T15S R42W; runs SW diagonally and then runs due north down Range line between R43W R42W to Sec. 36 T15S R43W. Cuts diagonally SW across Sec. 36 and Sec. 1 T16S R43W, where it rejoins original proposed C5 route running due south. Map 35.
- On map 19, in blue marker, T12S, R52W, Sec 19 (house): Don't get any closer to house.
- Proposed location along Morgan Washington CO.
- NW & N 1/2 S 1/2 15-7-47.
- 46 & 47, in purple marker, 17-23-34 & NE 30 & SE 18 22-36 36-21-37 W1/2 16-22-37.
- Line: Energy Center to Rolling Hills SW of Section 27: SE of Section 28, T21S, R42W Sixth PM (Hamilton, KS) and S1/2 of Section 26, T21S, R43W Sixth PM (Hamilton, KS).
- SW of section 25, T21S, R40W, Sixth PM, Hamilton, KS ECRHS-H-16.
- Craig Knoell, J8, 875 High Prairie Pt. Calhan 80808, one mile west of Hardle/ S. Calhan Hwy- half mile south. Added few other properties adjacent to mine.
- My family owns all of section 22, section 27, and the NE 1/4 of section 34 in Township 1N, Range 64W, in Weld County Colorado.
- On sheet map 1, in brown marker, Section 27, NE corner of section 34, section 22, in township 1N, Range 64W.
- Weld county, Colorado. M3 route is preferred to avoid disruption to active producing farm land on alternative route M4.
- Township 11S/ Range 56W/ Section 21.

Map Comments

- In purple pen on the J3 route- house near line (north) We would prefer you stay with the proposed J4 route.
- Limon, 2/13 on map 7 in purple marker T7S R56W, located properties.
- Section 25 T14S R62W of the 6th PM. Because we didn't know we wouldn't need to reference a map number we didn't. Larry Keith circled our place on the map we were looking at with a dark marker.
- NE 1/4 sec 4 T15S R60W. I wanted to attend the Hanover or Avondale meetings the last of Feb. but was unable to attend either because of unexpected circumstances I trust my comments will still be useful to you and helpful to the unique situation on my land.
- On map 47, would like to get a map to show T22R34S32 & T23R34S9. SW 1/4 5-23-34 Finney County.
- On the map shown Antioch and Calhan Hwy and surrounding land did not show the growth of several new residential properties.
- All were viewed and discussed w/ Mr. Hartman. He took notes and suggestions at that time. SE 1/2 SW 1/4 Range 61 Ts14. 30250 Antioch Rd, Yoder, CO 80864.
- As to the route down Harding Rd. From roadside to approximately 1/2 mile in is basically open. 7 pages of maps attached and considered in routing.
- In purple or blue marker, N 1/2 of section 27: NW of section 35, SW, SWSE of Section 6 T21S, R43W, Sixth PM, Prowers county, Colorado. In addition to these parcels we have Ag/aircraft spray strips as indicated on the maps and at the 2/21/2007 Lamar Meeting.
- In blue or purple marker N1/2 of section 27, NW of section 27; NW of section 35, SWSE of section 6 T21S, R43W, 6th PM, Prowers County, Colorado. Our aerial application landing strips were marked on the map- road SS north of Bristol, CO.
- While we understand Colorado's need for utility development, we hope you will consider our situation and the potentially devastating effects of this project.
- Finally, wherever possible, any new power lines should be located within existing utility easements adjacent to existing power lines to mitigate impacts to previously undisturbed lands.
- Financial compensation provided to landowners whose property is burdened with power lines is insufficient to mitigate the long-term deleterious [sic] effects to family-owned agricultural lands and the natural resources they support.
- While I know the line needs to go through and no one will want them, the concern I have is when they do go through, they do so with the least impacts as possible.
- I enjoy my quiet. Power lines humm [sic], devalue property, and will mess up the beautiful sunrise.
- The continuous noise from the lines, constant humming.

Map Comments

- I will suffer the rest of the time I live here having to deal with the continuous problems of the power lines humming, popping and the static discharge from the lines, not to mention that I do not have full use of my land.
- You must realize this will turn our quiet country home into an industrial area.
- But, at least I would wish that you would not increase the volume that the lines transmit.
- If you increase the volume of the lines the sound will be louder and the view will be worse.
- Two, at what ever volume they are currently at, they omitt [sic] a loud humming sound during the rain and/or snow. Loud enough to hear it from my front door which is about 100 yards away.
- I have enough interference with my 2-way radios, noise, AM radio and field obstructions to need anymore.
- Further, upon investigation and consultation with a real estate expert and appraiser knowledgeable about real estate in Pueblo County, Colorado it is our position that health risk associated with the combined 1200 kilovolts of power as well as the noise and visible pollution created by the same would substantially damage the value if not make the Owl Canyon Property unmarketable.
- Noise and Visual pollution.
- Norm Michal – Loose insulators on existing line; rattle all the time; cause interference (referred to Gary Mueller).
- Noise pollution.

Noise

- We have livestock that will be sensitive to the noise level that we as human may not hear all the time, plus the EMF.
- Married in 1969- raised family—now raising granddaughters (doing very well- honor roll/ student council/ scholarship awarded). Do not want at risk at any level- she is and will be a great asset to us all. You cannot and will not give us (written) garuntee [sic] that lines are safe i.e.: EMF-noise (effects on nervous system & general health, cancer).
- EMFs/ Noise @ human hearing & above & below human range, but still effecting humans and animals.
- It is imperative that someone let us know what our options are at this point. It appears as though the public comment period is about to end. We need to know who we are to contact.
- The "Midway Substation" is shown as an existing structure. A. Is this actually true? B. If so, why was I not notified of its being built? When was it built? 2. What, exactly, on the on the enclosed maps is: A. Already built? B. Proposed? It is not clear!!
- Damage to crop and pasture land caused by construction traffic.

Noise

- I am aware that these in the decision making position really don't care about such matters, but I want to voice my concern. Fortunately, this project does not cross our land.
- How does this project benefit me (the local person and landowner)? You need to explain how this project provides electricity for the local landowner (coop members).
- What happens to the existing transmission lines? Will they be abandon or removed?
- It would help to show some statistics of the increased use of electricity over the last 30 years in this area. Then state the anticipated time frame for this project, and how long will this meet the demand before additional power lines will be needed. How many years have the existing lines been in use?
- Do these high voltage lines increase reliability? Are the towers engineered for the worst ice and wind storms that are possible in this area?
- Why is there a need for these new transmission lines and substations? Has the capacity been reached on the existing lines?
- How can we help you? What needs do you have when you put transmission lines thru [sic] the farm ground?
- Nothing is an issue just questions and what expectations need to be discussed!
- The lack of street names other than #s on map 11.
- My concern is "where the project will cross my property" if it does or not, and how it will effect [sic] any structures or not.
- Did not receive any Notice.
- Need written notice—didn't receive original notification.
- Why is the proposed transmission line from Limon to Lamar necessary?

Process

- We want single steel pole on F1 where you go on our property.
- Recall: Transmission line meeting in (sic) several people. Looking to buy property on L12. Want to send in a letter a comments to project.
- Should have had a meeting in Kiowa county.
- Include priorities for line construction in Chapter 2 of Draft EIS.
- How long has this project been in the planning?
- I want to say that I do understand that the lines are needed and the need for more electric power.
- Aside from the aesthetic and health concerns there are very real worries about the safety of our children during what promises to be a long drawn our construction process.
- I own sections 10, 15, and west half of 14, T7S R49W and would like to how I might me affected by the project.

Process

- Now this new info puts the line running east to west on the southern border of our section 18, what happened?
- What if any consideration has been made by TriState/Western to the design and routing of such transmission lines to accommodate the interconnection of renewable (primarily wind) energy projects along its path?
- What is the viability of the coal projects- are they going to be built or is this just planning stage preparation- when will final approval be granted.
- I know that you have to worry about cost, but it would be great if you could put these lines underground, then I would not hear or see them.
- Is there a concern about existing wells or the ability to place more well near the lines?
- The maps I have seen do not detail the sections clearly enough for me to know how worried I should be about my and my sister's land.
- Would property on the proposed route be considered "on grid" enough to allow wind farm input into the grid?
- We have reviewed your website however cannot determine if any of our easements may be impacted by this pipeline. Do you have any shape files that are more specific than what you have on the web.
- We also want to make you aware that Arapahoe County has a 1041 (Areas and Activities of State Interest) permitting process for Major Facilities of a Public Utility for transmission lines. Enclosed is a copy of our regulations.
- In making these recommendations we are in no way speaking for the property owners.
- While we realize that because this project has a federal pre-emption of local regulations because of WAPA, it is our understanding that the permitting process requirements should be done as a part of the federal permitting process per federal regulations.
- We look forward to the results of your environmental impact analysis and permitting process that specifically pertains to the County's 1041 permit requirements.
- Arapahoe County, in conjunction with the Trust for Public Lands, has gone through a "Greenprinting" (constraint mapping) process in order to determine environmental constraints and opportunities. Most of the comments that we will make are predicated on the results of our Greenprinting process.
- They asked when construction would begin (2009), they asked if the routes were final (NO.) and asked if the structures would be poles or towers.
- Mr. Brantley phoned in to ask questions about the public meetings. He wanted to know the format of the meetings and I informed him it would be an "open house" format with representatives from Western, Tri-state, and EDAW present to ask questions.

Process

- He was concerned about the time limit and that he would be able to visit all of the tables and ask the questions he needed to ask.
- He wondered if the lines would be right next to the road, I stated as close as practical, unlike a simple telephone pole the towers have a certain width and would "overhang" the road if they were placed right next to the road.
- At this point the centerline appears to be west of the east section line running north to south and it encroaches a few hundred feet (approximate—according to the map).
- Mr. Conlin asked where the centerline would be placed within the one mile corridor.
- When will the final route be decided and when will we be notified if our property will be involved.
- What research or statistics are there to evaluate the decline of property value due to the transmission towers.
- What kind of barriers will put around the poles so cattle don't rub against them?
- Just want you to be aware I have horses grazing on my land. Currently I do not have a way of isolating them if there is to be any work on my property.
- Our land is enrolled in Gov't CRP program. Would this project have any impact on the CRP program?
- Re-draw of proposed F1 route in Sections 2, 3, and 10 T21S R43W. Section 2 is grazing to cultivated land. Re-draw runs south on Section line, west on Section line (Sec. 2), and south down 29.00 Rd into Sec. 23, where it cuts diagonally NW to SE into the Energy Center substation. They prefer single pole. Map 36.
- I (K. Kampbell) answered a few of his questions but advised him that there would be realty specialists at the public meetings and he stated he would try and attend the one at Lamar.
- He asked about the project I explained the ROD would be in Spring 2008, the DEIS in late Summer 2007, and the alternatives of participation or project happening are addressed in those documents as the scoping process continues.
- Ms. Henderson called because she received a map in the mail and was concerned that a substation site would be on her property. She asked that I email her an aerial map and a sheet map (Sheet map 1) for her property (sec. 22 & 27, T1N, R64W) She also stated that she would try and attend the public meeting in Colorado Springs.
- 2/22/07: Mrs. Henderson wanted to verify we had sent the maps to her per her request on 2/21/07, she had been sent the information (at least twice). She wanted to know if M3 or M4 would effect her land. M4 would, she was wondering if there would be a substation located there, if M4 is selected there would be. She did not receive the scoping packet until 2/17/07 which was after the Byers mtg., which would have been the closest location for her.
- She asked how the land value was determined (third party appraisal, market value, only purchase ROW, not land); how wide the ROW would be (200 ft.), what kind of towers would be used (steel lattice).

Process

- Can you go underground?
- We were advised no information was available and there was no concern. This is an unacceptable answer to what appears to be a valid concern.
- Related question: When a transmission line is proposed to follow an existing county road, as it is with J4 in that area of the Skinner holdings, how is the decision made as to which side of the road, and thus which landowner's holdings, will be used as the actual route?
- Timothy Newton —why not use state land? Concern with effect on animals; how old is map? Decided project wouldn't affect his property.
- Bob Wilger—grazing land use converted to dry crops in T21SR43W, Section 2; alternative drawn on Sheet 36; requested that single steel poles be used; requested annual payments for easements.
- Skip Crist—concern with spanning ½ mile pivots; also concern with where structures will be located next to roads.
- Lance Whitey—prefers single pole in agricultural land; otherwise, opposes preferred alternative.
- What is the schedule for the public review process?
- What is the purpose of notifying landowners who are not directly affected by the project [within the 3 mile notification corridor width].
- Maximize the space between structures.
- She has conservation work done on her property that was part of a government cost share—we are going to.
- Destroy her efforts to return the property to pristine condition, it take 3-4 years or more to recover from construction impacts.
- How often will maintenance forces be on her property.
- How long will construction activities be on her property.
- He will permit survey and geology studies, but will not allow any environmental work to be done on his property should he even sign the ROE.
- When I think of the damage that will be done by taking heavy equipment through, even one time, I know we will be dealing with the damage forever. The routes left by the wagon wheels on the Santa Fe Trail, are still visible to this day- and that wasn't done by heavy equipment!!
- Why would the Project look for reroutes to avoid houses in some areas, but not others?
- Why would the project reroute for a gun club, but not residences?
- It is a "sham" to not have more precise maps! I could not go to the Limon meetings due to a medical emergency. As I read the proposals to put a power generation plant west of Garden City, powered by coal, The Plan seems to be "flawed".

Process

- Mountain View came in to replace an underground line across my pasture and fields following the big line. They surveyed and staked 2 miles and did not contact me. I went to farm and here were all of those stakes in the field that were in the path of my irrigation sprinkler. TOTALLY UNACPETABLE [sic].
- With the proposed Eastern Plains Transmission Project maps in front of me, I cannot tell if the proposed lines go across my irrigated land or where they go. These are such vague maps that I don't know if I need to object or try to correct a line route that I can live with.
- Further, I would appreciate any technical information as to the transmission line proposed and follow-up in either an email or writing as to the footprint dimensions of the proposed line, and the projects period of performance to include all phases of the project.
- Letter dated 2-26-2007 with agreement for right of entry appears the proposed towers are on (sic), Nickerson.
- In addition, the EIS should consider reasonable alternatives to overhead powerlines, such as the alternative of underground transmission lines.
- The criteria developed by the Western Area Power Administration to evaluate potential locations for electrical transmission lines, as described in the January 2007 Transmission Project newsletter, unfairly discriminates against historic agricultural lands in favor of more recent residential developments and land uses.
- The Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS") must consider the cumulative impacts of the Transmission Project in conjunction with impacts to these agricultural properties caused by other reasonably foreseeable future project.
- Based upon our review of the most recent map depicting proposed and alternatives routes, it appears that all of the alternatives presently under consideration would cross Frost Livestock lands. The EIS must consider at least one alternative route for the Boone to Midway segment that does not cross the Frost Livestock Ranch.
- Section 27 is the location of the proposed EPTP alternate power line route and switching station site (identified as M4). For the following reasons, you should choose M3 as the preferred route: 3. The alternate route on section 27 does not make good economic sense. The alternate route comes from the south, then doglegs one-half mile to the west, and then turns north again, right through the middle of section 27. This dogleg is purported to be due to a non-residential structure (small tank) on section 26. Yet, this dogleg runs adjacent to a tank, pump house and pit, not to mention an active oil well on the SE corner of section 27. Every turn increases the number of power poles on the property and increases EPTP costs dramatically. If the M4 alternate route is in fact selected, it would make more sense, economically, to minimize the length of the east-west dogleg (staying as close to the eastern property line as possible.) Not only would EPTP save the cost of wire for this 1/2 mile segment, it would reduce the impact on our farming operations.
- Mrs. Henderson received conflicting information at the public meeting on the size and type of interconnection that would be located where M4 meets up with the HT-EE line. Someone said it would be a pole-mounted device, someone else said it would be a substation.

Process

- After discussing this with Randall Medicine Bear and Bob Easton, I called Ms. Henderson back and told her it would be a substation with an approximate size of 5-10 acres, although it has not yet been designed.
- I am concerned that your EPTP analysis did not find out more about the land use by us and others in this area. Steel Fork Pheasants, LLC has been a state park for almost six years now and your analysts should have been more thorough in the study of land use.
- Also what kind of towers are going to be installed in this area i.e. dimensions and affected [sic] area. Thank You.
- The F8 route will require more towers be installed (south and west of Hugo) due to the topography of the ground which has severe elevation changes through the sand hills. The F7 route has much leveler topography (north and east of Hugo) which should require less towers.
- Have you considered actually utilizing present roads as part of the easement instead of intruding into privately owned property?
- Would you be willing to try to work with me, to "go around" me by a few more miles, to make it possible for me to continue to survive and make progress? I know you must do something... I honestly understand that. I know, too, that many will fight you with "both barrels" for a variety of reasons, but I do not want to cause trouble.
- A 200 foot permanent easement is required. Is there a plan to request a temporary construction easement during construction?
- Does Colorado have any set guidelines for electric/magnetic field levels for newly constructed transmission lines? If so, what are they?
- How many wires will be connected and how high will they be off of the ground?
- What is the proposed timing of this project? When would construction begin and how long would it last? Is construction season sensitive?
- How far will the towers be spaced apart? How tall are the towers? What would the towers be constructed out of?
- In addition to the high altitude photos we urge that a closer inspection of the proposed routes and their impact be done.
- What is wrong with using county rights of way? I was originally told that the line would be following 1-70. What has happened to this proposal?
- My farming operation in Eastern Colorado would be seriously hindered by transmission lines across the property. Please include this comment in the EIS scoping process.
- This program should be stopped till the people are given the same consideration that an environmental impact study would provide for the environment. Thank you.
- I would like a description of the supporting structures for the transmission line, including appearance, height, and spacing.

Process

- What impact will your high voltage lines have on the lower voltage lines that provide our service?
- An additional concern, and other questions, relate to our own electrical provider. Undoubtedly IREA also will need to upgrade their carrying capacity in the near future. Will your placements preclude IREA from having access to the most efficient siting for their lines?
- Your proposed and alternative routes impact too many homes and people who live in the corridor from Midway to Big Sandy. Your maps are outdated and do not show the homes that are presently in the corridor.
- Again I would encourage the use of a single pole system.
- Single towers would be better than double.
- Prefer the poles be mono-poles and located on the south side of the roads to minimize impact on terrace.
- We who live our here are in a state of shock due to the extremely short notice we have received. Until about a month ago we had no idea such a project was being planned. Please take more time to carefully consider the impact this project would have on us.
- The maps that WAPA is using are not up to date and do not show many of the homes in our area. Several more homes are to be set up in our subdivision and other nearby areas.
- Will Western Area Power Administration be the one that guarantee the finances on the Power lines and the power plants?
- Do you clean up if you quit using the lines?
- Is there going space on the lines for renewable energy?
- Do you pay damage for the surveyors?
- I explained the next steps in the NEPA process as well.
- We want single poles vs. towers that are projected because: farming easier around pole vs. tower, not as much waste and land needed for production to feed our county, weed control will be eliminated by you under a tower.
- This also crosses an area you and I discussed that is larger ranches and less concentration of homes. They also are mostly 'homesteaded' ranches. And possibly less likely to sub-divide. Yet it does allow for separate routing of circuits as you indicated you prefer. This is one area I see worth while to investigate. Yet I do not have the mapping that you do. So I will ask you to look into this area and see if it can not be made to work.
- If these are our only options, we will in no way consider your power lines cutting through the center of our property and will use any and every legal option available to us to stop this action. I look forward in hearing from you regarding this manner.
- We received the information regarding the installation of possible power lines affecting our property. I am writing this letter in response to your proposal.

Process

- We are horrified at what we have learned in the past few hours. One of the first questions is why no public or private official connected with this project has contacted us directly?
- Ms. Jennings phoned because she received a new landowner notification letter in the mail and was very upset that she had not been contacted earlier regarding the transmission line project. Based on the map she received along with the letter, she is certain that the transmission line will be directly above her residence and she has questions on how she will be compensated for any damages or loss of property that may occur.
- Mrs. Spurlin was upset because the map she received didn't show her property and the map seems to show the route encroaching on her property, nor was she contacted prior to the mailings. I (Rudy) pulled up her information and informed her the alternative route in her vicinity is 1.4 miles from her property (as shown on the map), she requested a copy of the aerial map with overlay, she was informed that she would be able to provide comment and view other scoping material at the meetings shown on the scoping packet she received. - 1/24/07 - Rudy Apodaca T 13S - R 61W - Sec SW1/4 22.
- The "Midway Substation" is shown as an existing structure. A. Is this actually true? B. If so, why was I not notified of its being built? When was it built? 2. What, exactly, on the enclosed maps is: A. Already built? B. Proposed? It is not clear!!

Public Involvement

- I (Hiroshi Ohashi) do not give permission to build high voltage transmission or tower, enough notice given if to build [damaged].
- Will verify she is on the mailing list.
- Mrs. Andersen - Higgins hadn't received a packet as of yet, she requested an aerial map and verification that she would be mailed a scoping packet.
- I received a written notification via mail on January 22nd, 2007 regarding the proposed "Eastern Plains Transmission Project". This email contains a few of the preliminary questions and concerns I have regarding this proposal.
- First, I am concerned that my husband and I have owned this property since October 2005 and this is the very first notification we have received. No one has contacted us or asked for our permission to access our property to study any "biological, cultural, and other environmental resources and visual and land use impacts" (quote taken from the Working With Landowners brochure you included in the notification packet). The only group of people that have requested our permission to access and study our land are an environmental agency studying a very specific bird habitat our land provides.
- Furthermore, I noticed that none of the scheduled meeting locations are in an area near our residence. I will have to take off from work to drive to another town to be able to attend. Is there compensation for lost wages and inconvenience for not having a meeting in our town?

Public Involvement

- I request someone contact me as soon as possible to address my preliminary questions and concerns. Additionally, I request the following: -a detailed map sent to me showing the exact property descriptions of the proposed high-voltage transmission lines -a picture representation of said proposed high-voltage transmission lines - detailed empirical data regarding the health risks of said proposed high-voltage transmission lines.
- Thank you for your time and consideration of this matter. I can be reached at this e-mail address, my home telephone number (719) 478-2529 (available in the evenings or weekends), or my cellular phone number (281) 543-4150.
- Some of your glossary of terms are not stated very friendly. For example; Easement - says you have certain rights, well what rights? And the worst are the words "judgment in condemnation". These are fighting words that you will have to overcome. An example would be to state an easement is xx number of feet wide for a 500 kV line and can only be used for the purpose of the electric transmission line and its maintenance. No other entity can use this easement for another purpose unless they pay the landowner the proper value for an easement.
- I received a packet from Western Area Power Administration regarding the Eastern Plains Transmission Project asking for comments about the project.
- How does this project benefit me (the local person and landowner)? You need to explain how this project provides electricity for the local landowner (coop members).
- For your information when the Super Slab promoters were trying to obtain a corridor for their project, the citizens of these two counties rallied against them. It was a strip of land several miles wide and not very specific as to where the road would really go. The citizens were able to get Eminent Domain laws changed so now it will be very difficult for the Super Slab to ever be built. Along this same line of citizen thinking, Xcel Energy Corporation attempted to build a new 345 kV transmission line across these two counties and came up against strong resistance. Their procedure was a fiasco in public relations. Xcel apparently retreated and built in their existing right of way.
- Your "Working With Landowners" brochure is lacking in explaining how this transmission project will benefit anyone living in the area. All the local cooperatives and Tri State can not afford to have a public relations failure over this project. You need to, at least, answer the following questions:
 - There are probably more questions to be answered in a personal way to make the individual landowners feel they are important. A good source would be to ask local coops to help with this information. The maps are well done and asking for input is positive.
 - Will cooperate in any way.
 - We are interested in hearing more about this project.
 - So far been real helpful with concerns on where lines go.
 - Send update map when available.
 - Want 11x 17 sheet map #36- send.

Public Involvement

- Greeley District Manager Curtis Talley, Sterling District Manager Danny Skalla, Pueblo District Manager John Valentine.
- They work with the public in a very positive manner.
- I really appreciate the way Western runs the public meetings and having the information available.
- After viewing the locations, and speaking with your representatives about our concerns with animals grazing, farming operations, and electrical interruptions we have no concerns with this crossing our properties and support the choices you've made to cross through our properties as we continue with day to day operations- Christine & Greg Talbert.
- Do not appreciate attitude of real estate representative. Backing of condemnation, et. Not a good tactic to use with people. Best to say interested in coming to an agreement, but work with landowners.
- Gone June-Nov. in Alberta. 403-627-1415.
- Send maps 45 & 46.
- Please send 11x17 sheet map # 45.
- Did not receive any Notice.
- Appreciate information and being helpful.
- Need written notice- didn't receive original notification.
- I want to be kept aware of all issues regarding the mentioned property.
- Hartman referred to website and said if can't get them from there give me a call. I will send to him as fax.
- Should have had a meeting in Kiowa county.
- Would like to be contacted for discussions of structure placement on the property. Would like to maximize spans on the property.
- Will submit additional comments to Hartman.
- Talked to your representative, they were not only knowledgeable but extremely personable.
- We should consider a field meeting with residents on J4 to route area s. of Sanborn Road, and Yoder Road.
- Would like at least one meeting with a formal presentation followed by Q&A from the public.
- For those without super fast internet connections it would be very beneficial to have handouts of all the display boards shown at the meetings.
- Request map #12.
- Make sure seniors have transportation to the draft EIS hearings and consider school busing and use of schools for hearing.

Public Involvement

- Do a better job of informing people first time around. Explain how it costs more to go through totally open ground way east of Byers & Deertrail, because your people can't.
- I just wanted to see where these proposed lines were going to be in relation to our farmland N&W of Bennett.
- Even though the section of line that was through our property originally has changed we would certainly like to stay on your mailing list.
- John Hanks Ranch registered "Deter/Hanks" Miss Kennedy said she would send small copy of sheet map #2.
- Will we be notified if there are any parcel/ location/ route changes?
- At the first set of meetings we were concerned about "where" the transmission line would run (particularly L2).
- Please call me with any changes. I was not notified on the first wave.
- Please "communicate" better through direct mailings.
- Please send 11x17 sheet map 3 & 4.
- Sheet map #1- please send 11x17, please send 2 maps.
- Please send a CD with a full set of 11x17 sheet maps.
- Some of my concerns are: Why are there NOT any public meetings nearby where the project is going to happen? Such as the Yoder & Ellicott residents. Can such meetings be scheduled to this area?
- There are schools in this area that have room to hold meetings at.
- I do have several concerns about this project that is proposed.
- There are many people in this area that are affected and all meeting are at some distance away.
- I want to attend the meeting but because of work and the weather at this time I am not able to attend the distant scheduled meetings.
- Did the previous owners know about this and if so why we were not notified.
- Thank you in advance for considering our predicament.
- We have been advised about the proposed high voltage power line project which is projected to run through our property, directly alongside our home and barn.
- I mailed him a comment form as well as an aerial map of his property.
- Mr. Ridder called because he was unable to attend the public meetings and he wanted to verify that he was reading the map he had correctly, and that the route near his property was an alternate route as opposed to a proposed line.
- I live in Arvada Colorado and I would like to know if there will be any meetings held in or around this area.

Public Involvement

- Please tell me more specifically where the alternative route goes.
- Could you send me a map with all roads and intersections that concern the corner of Harback Rd & 128th Ave., Adams County Colorado. Thank you Bret Corbin.
- I have received a notice of this project in the mail with a map, I would like to know if this will cross my farm, the map does not go into detail enough to see were [sic] the lines will be.
- I went to Fountain, CO last fall to see the route the line would take in relation to our property owned by the Koepke Family LLC in Arapahoe CO, (T4S R59W SE 1/4 sec. 6 South 1/2 sec. 5, north 1/2 sec. 8, sec. 7, and sec. 18) At that time it was going to be close but just off the SW corner of our section 18.
- First... You have already caused confusion by now designating B routes as routes that were previously designated A routes.. And vis-versa. [sic].
- We have reviewed your website however cannot determine if any of our easements may be impacted by this pipeline. Do you have any shape files that are more specific than what you have on the web.
- 15 of these units currently have houses on them and the others probably will in the near future. Most of these houses were not on your map.
- Mr. Agnew has land in the area, his mother received (possibly) the project mailer and he was wondering how the project would potentially effect the land they own. He requested a more detailed map. The land may be under his mother's name, Thelma Agnew.
- Send a more detailed map.
- She asked my relationship to the project and my background in EMF. I told her that I am a consultant to WAPA and that I have published research on the subject and also spoken to other principle investigators in the EMF research field. I offered to send her a copy of my published research articles and a link to the EMF RAPID web page at NIH so she can download their EMF brochure.
- Angela has sent WAPA an email addressing concerns about EMF health effects on the proposed EPTP project. I called Angela on February 8 to discuss her concerns and left her a message. She returned my call on February 9. I called her again and this time we spoke live.
- I told her that when she comes to the meeting in Hanover, we can talk directly and I can answer her questions. Before then, she will send me an E mail with her address. I will respond with my contact information and a copy of my research articles and a link to the NIH web page.
- If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact me at 720-874-6665 or at sfeher@co.arapahoe.co.us.
- We have appreciated the opportunity to discuss the EPTP with EDAW and in particular work with Matt Schweich. The Arapahoe County Planning Division would like to make the following comments regarding proposed corridors for the EPTP in Arapahoe County, Colorado.

Public Involvement

- Larry Lusher phoned in to request an aerial map of his clients' property (Section 9, T20S, R49W). He requested it be emailed to him as the property is about to be sold.
- Mr. Beeson left a message stating that he would not be able to make the public meeting in Burlington due to weather.
- I looked up his property coordinates on GIS (N 1/2 of section 30, T10S, R45W) and verified that the alternate route was actually a mile and a half north of his property. I also looked on Sheet Map 51 and confirmed that.
- I called him back to make sure he didn't have any questions and he expressed some concern that according to the sheet map he received, the proposed route was going through his property.
- I offered to mail him the aerial map, but Mr. Beeson stated he did not need it and he would not worry about it.
- I am the secured lender on property located near, or perhaps in, your project. The property is known as, and is in the name of, BAAB steel, and is located near Midway, Colorado, east of 1-25 and immediately east of and contiguous with of the US Truck Driving School.
- The property is currently in foreclosure and will be sold sometime in the near future. It is possible that I may become the owner of the property by virtue of my secured position, and I need to more clearly identify the exact.
- Location of your proposed project. Should you so desire, I would be happy to provide you with legal descriptions of the property in which I am involved.
- I would be appreciative if you could be more specific as to the proposed legal description, and perhaps inform me of the relationships of your possible taking with the BAAB property.
- He referred me to two articles in "The Gazette", both from 1998 about the Bohart Ranch and Chico Basin. He thought that the articles could be obtained off the internet at Coloradosprings.com and Gazette.com, or CO-OL.com one article has an access number 209071 "preserving the high plains" 08/30/1998; associated with a reporter named "Pam Zubeck".
- Mr. Edmundson requested to speak with someone from Tri-State; I referred him to Mike Barningham.
- He would like to see a copy of the aerial photo with the route overlay. He couldn't make it to Byers due to the weather.
- Mr. Bordner wasn't able to tell if the routes were in the vicinity [sic] of his property, based on the maps he received. I let him know that the proposed route in his area doesn't effect his land, however, the alternative may.
- Mr. Bradshaw requested a more detailed map, as he is curious regarding the proximity of the route to his land. He asked if the B18-B20 segments were proposed sections.
- (2/15/07) Mr. Bradshaw and Mr. Agnew asked for help interpreting the maps sent to them, it turns out that Mr. Agnew's land isn't effected [sic] and Mr. Bradshaw's land in Hamilton County is.

Public Involvement

- I assured him that depending on the turnout, he should have enough time to visit the tables he needed and I also gave him specific names of people who could address his questions.
- Mr. Brantley called because he wanted a map that would cover the whole area of Pueblo County or at least from Midway to Boone.
- He was concerned about the time limit and that he would be able to visit all of the tables and ask the questions he needed to ask.
- Mr. Brantley phoned in to ask questions about the public meetings. He wanted to know the format of the meetings and I informed him it would be an "open house" format with representatives from Western, Tri-state, and EDAW present to ask questions.
- Would it be possible to see a map of the proposed line in Kiowa County? If the map could include sections and more detail than in the general mailing, it would be so appreciated.
- I felt the map was not correct since I only found four roads in El Paso county, El Paso County roads are named where Elbert and Lincoln are numbered.
- Can you email me a blow-up of the L9, L15, L12, and L14 proposals that will include the section lines. We own all of section 2, the SW 1/4 of section 12, and the NE1/4 section 10 in township 3 south, range 61 west.
- I hope you can email me a blow-up of the area. The maps at the Byers meetings were helpful once I got oriented, however, I would like to study some more at home.
- Mr. Conrad phoned in because he received a pamphlet in his electric bill but had not received any other letter or maps regarding the project. He requested we send him a aerial map of his property, as well as a sheet map that would show where the 500kV lines may be going.
- I directed him to the online comment form and told him to call back if he could fill our the online comment form or find the hardcopy that was sent to him in his packet.
- He was informed that the routes are not final, and that we try to follow roads or other utility corridors when we can, however in some instances like center pivots other routes are developed.
- Holley, Albertson & Polk Law Firm client.
- This is in direct opposition to the path of the proposed Eastern Plains Transmission Project.
- I am not sure why we did not receive information in writing about this proposed action on our business?
- I felt your meeting & the personnel were very informative and knowledgeable about the project.
- Currently it looks like the proposed route is 3/4 mile from our property and we were told we would be updated with any changes and future meetings. At this time I do not have any other concerns or issues.
- I wish you would schedule a public meeting on a weekend so I could attend. I work and stay in Denver 5 days a week and could not attend any of your meetings.

Public Involvement

- Mr. Diedrich stated he was unable to determine where the route was in relation to his land, he asked that a more detailed map be sent to him. Sec. 6,8, T4S, R60W; Sec 12, T4S, R61W.
- Ernie had called WAPA on February 21, 2007 about concerns with radio interference and effects on his organic farming practices from the proposed EPTP project. I (Bob Pearson) called Ernie on February 22nd to discuss his concerns.
- I suggested that he talk to Danny Pearson of Xcel's transmission engineering group. I called Danny and asked that he call Ernie to discuss these concerns.
- Mrs. Francis said she has land in Prowers County and lives in Oklahoma. She may attend the Lakin meetings, however she would like to receive a scoping packet in the event she doesn't make it to Lakin.
- She stated she received a post card in December 2006, but hasn't heard or received any correspondence since that time.
- I told her when and where the Lakin meeting was and sent her a scoping document package also.
- He has questions/issues near L12 North of Byers (Evergreen Country Estates) he states that there are a number of landowners in the area upset about L12. They would like to know when the next meetings will be.
- Frank called and asked that Jim Hartman return his phone call.
- Jim Hartman spoke to Mr. Fuller, who request that an aerial photo with the route overlay be sent to him via his son.
- Owns 1600 acres east of Hwy 71 south of Last Chance. He would like a comment form and information packet.
- Wanted to talk about project on property.
- Ms. Gavera called because she had received a package on the project, and because she had just bought the property, it was the first time she had ever heard anything about it.
- I also told her we could send her a better map that would show how close the proposed or alternate route was to her property. I looked up her coordinates on the assessor website for El Paso County (SE 1/4 SE 1/4 Section 27, T13S, R61W).
- Mr. Glover called because he is an attorney and has a client whose property may be affected by the project. He provided me with the legal description of his client's property (Section 30 T20S, R62W; sections 13, 24, 25, T20S, R63W) and asked for the voltage of the line. It was determined from the maps that it will be a 500kV line.
- I made this suggestion at the meeting in Lakin and was told to put the idea on this form and send it in. To reduce cost and various landowner ill-will it would seem logical to use the one route going North our of Holcomb to the Burlington substation for both Lamar and Burlington.

Public Involvement

- I explained that most of the general information about the project was included in the mailing he received (second hand) and that if he had any specific questions I could address those. He said he'd review the map and the project information, but had no specific questions. Sec. 1, 21, 22, 26, 28, 27, 34, T19S, R55W, Sec 3, T20S, R55W. His neighbors property (now his) may be listed under Dorothy Brunch.
- Mr. Heil didn't receive any notification as has land in Crowley County, he inherited land near his and was forwarded a scoping packet by the deceased's lawyer. He wondered why he hadn't received any notices mailed to him.
- I told him I would include him in the data base and make sure he'd receive future mailing. I also told him I'd send him an aerial view of his land with the route overlay.
- Mr. Hendersen couldn't tell if any routes were crossing his property from the maps he received. His property is not identified as being effected [sic] by either nearby alternative routes. He stated he did not want to travel to Byers in the snow, since his land wasn't effected [sic] he will not attend. Sec. SW4, NW4, T2S, R62W.
- Ms. Higgins left a message requesting that a better map be emailed to her for her property (7S, 54W and 8S, 54W). Also wanted to let us know that a house was going to be built on her son's property (NW 1/4 section 22, 7S, 54W).
- Mr. Holmes phoned in to leave a comment. He stated that he is for Western/Tri-State using his land for transmission lines and has no problem with the project.
- Mr. House phoned because he was unable to determine what type of route was crossing his property from the map he had received previously. He provided me with his property coordinates (sections 1, 2, 11, 12, 13, 14, 24 T10S R40W) and I was able to determine that an alternative route was crossing his property. He asked that I send him an aerial map.
- After viewing the aerial map at the Byers School meeting on Feb 16th, and the answers we received to our questions and for the most logical reasons we are strongly in favor of the proposed route, and for the same reasons, strongly opposed to the alternative routes.
- Send me an aerial view of the map, especially the Byers area.
- Mr. Janitell attended the scoping meeting in Sharon Springs on 2/20/07, he forgot to check on a parcel of land and would like to have the aerial photo with the route overlay sent to him. Sec. S1/2 19, T14S, R40W.
- No comments.
- Mr. Knight phoned because the only information he had received was a postcard regarding EPTP and he wanted a map that would show if his property would actually be affected by the proposed route. He provided his property coordinates (w1/2 section 13, T2S, R55W).
- He was a little upset and asked that I email him the email map I looked up on GIS that confirmed the proposed route was touching the southern part of his property.

Public Involvement

- Mr. Koepke called because he received a map in the mail and he was concerned because it appeared from that map that the proposed route was actually on his property.
- He had attended a public meeting last summer and at that time he understood that the proposed route was not touching his property.
- I emailed him the aerial map as well as Sheet Map 2. He stated he would review the maps and call back.
- Mr. Wind would like to see a more detailed map, as the map he received did not provide enough detail in reference to his land (Sec. 14, T2N R56W). He would like an aerial photo with the route overlay as well as sheet map 3.
- I (K. Kampbell) mailed him a comment form as well as an aerial map of his property.
- Mr. Ridder called because he was unable to attend public meetings and he wanted to verify that he was reading the map he had correctly, and that the route near his property was an alternate route as opposed to a proposed route.
- Mr. Williams phoned in to request an aerial map for his property (NW1/2 Sec. 17 T17S R65W).
- Mr. Wiggins phoned because he wanted us to send him an aerial map that would show if the proposed or alternative routes are anywhere near his property (NW1/2 10 22S, 36W; NW1/2 11 22S, 36W).
- I (K. Kampbell) told him I would send him an aerial map and if he had further questions after receiving it, to give us a call back.
- He also stated he sent in a comment form, he is unable to attend the Sharon Springs meeting in Feb.
- Mr. Thoma hasn't received project information and would like to see if his land is impacted by the project,(Sec. 31 T3S R54W, Sec. 7, 18, 19 T4S R54W).
- He is very accepting of the project he would simply appreciate more detailed information.
- Mr. Shaw phoned because he has received an aerial which showed both the proposed and alternative routes going along his property. He had questions regarding the process by which Western would obtain an easement on his property and the process of condemnation.
- He asked that if he could not attend the meeting, that someone would send him information on the process of purchasing easements, condemnation, etc.
- Mr. Shaw said he spoke with someone yesterday, who informed him that if he provided a legal description of this land we could forward him a map with overlay. His land is Sec. SE1/4 NW1/4, T1S, R63W.
- Ms. Scott called to request two extra scoping packets for her siblings. Her mother who is the land owner passed away in December and she'd like to pass the information onto her brother and sister who are also beneficiaries.

Public Involvement

- She was directed to the project website online comment form, which she will use if she doesn't make it to the Hanover meeting. rockinjs@earthlink.com or.net, she is not sure.
- 2/22/07: Mrs. Henderson wanted to verify we had sent the maps to her per her request on 2/21/07, she had been sent the information (at least twice). She wanted to know if M3 or M4 would effect her land. M4 would, she was wondering if there would be a substation located there, if M4 is selected there would be. She did not receive the scoping packet until 2/17/07 which was after the Byers mtg., which would have been the closest location for her.
- Ms. Henderson called because she received a map in the mail and was concerned that a substation site would be on her property. She asked that I email her an aerial map and a sheet map (Sheet map 1) for her property (sec. 22 & 27, T1N, R64W) She also stated that she would try and attend the public meeting in Colorado Springs.
- Mrs. Salem stated that she couldn't tell if her land was going to be impacted by the proposed or alternative route. She asked for an aerial photo to be sent to her. Sec. SE 1/4 10, T21S, R39W.
- Mr. Rueb phoned because his father had received information on EPTP and he believes his property will also be affected by the proposed line. He provided his property coordinates (Sec. 14 T8S R48W; Sec. 23 T8S R48W) and requested a map be sent to him.
- Mr. Robertson did not receive any project information directly. The mailer was sent to his old address and he didn't receive it until 2/13/07, which was after the Limon meeting date. He requested to be added to the mailing list, as well as how best to provide comments. I directed him to the website, he said he would provide comments using the online comment form. He wants to suggest one of the alternative routes vs. the proposed route in his area.
- Her sister's land (Sec. 8 T23S R34W) may be affected, as a corridor runs between Sections 7 and 8 of that T&R; this Section has center pivot irrigation and is a concern for her and her sister.
- She asked how to best provide her comments/concerns; as she has internet access I directed her to the project on-line comment form, she stated she would fill the form out online.
- Mrs. Pierce wanted to know if her land in Finney Co. would be on or near the EPTP route. Sec. 33 T22S R34W. The route runs through Sec. 31 of that Township and Range.
- He asked that a more detailed map be sent to him so that he could determine exactly where the proposed line may sit in relation to his property. He provided his legal description Sec. 25 T14S R62W.
- Ms. Parker phoned because she was not sure she would be able to make the Limon Public Meeting due to weather conditions. She wanted to verify that the same people would be at all the public meetings and when I told her they would be, she stated she may attend the Hanover meeting instead and hope for better weather.
- Mr. Williams called because he now had the legal description for his property and wanted to request an aerial map. He provided the legal description SE1/2, Sec. 31 T8S R43W and asked that I email the map.

Public Involvement

- Mr. Williams phoned in because he is in charge of a correctional facility that will be expanding and he was uncertain as to how the proposed line may affect their expansion. I informed him that if he could provide his property coordinates that we could send him an aerial map that would better show just how close the proposed route is to the property.
- We reviewed maps on the phone, however he was uncertain as to the exact coordinates and I could not determine from our maps where the property was located.
- She wanted to know when and where the mtg. in Lakin, KS was and I shared that with her. The route does at this point does seem to cross some of her property and I ensured her that she would be added to the database, neither her nor myself could determine why she was not sent any information (Sections 13, 24, 25, 31 T17S R43W; Sections 27, 33, 34, 35 T19S R44W).
- Ms Murdock stated she did not receive a packet of project information, she found the website.
- They will forward legals for the maps and complete a comment form in relation to the EMF issues. Sections 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 28, 33, & 34 T4S R58W; Sections 3, 4, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 28, 29, 32, 33, 34 & 35 T5S R58W; Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 13, 24 & 25 T6S R58W; Sections 1-36 T6S R57W.
- Denver Metro Wastewater requested a more detailed map they have 5 2,000 acres east of Deer Trail and lease some land to a farmer, who received a scoping packet.
- Ms. Blackburn called because she could not determine if the proposed or alternate route was going through her property (Sections 28 & 33, T1S R64W) from the map that was sent to her. I was able to determine from an aerial map that the alternate route was approximately 1/2 mile away from her property and the proposed route was 2.2 miles away from her property. She asked me to mail out the aerial map to her.
- Ms. Mason received a package in the mail regarding EPTP and called to request a better map in order to determine how close the proposed route actually is to her property. Her property is located at S1/2 S1/2 and NE1/4 of Sec. 22, T10S R52W in Kit Carson County.
- Ms. Meek phoned in to request an aerial map to determine how close the proposed route is to her property.
- She mentioned that she would not be able to attend the public meeting but she was concerned about EMF and wanted further information on that. I stated that I believed a person would be present at the meeting who could provide information on that subject and she decided to send her husband if he could make it.
- Mr. Meinzer called to request an aerial map of his mother's property (W1/2 of Sec. 27; E1/2 & SW1/4 of Sec. 28; SE1/4 of Sec. 31; and all of Sec. 33, T14S, 59W). He also requested a map be sent to him that would show the alt. route from Midway to Boone (Sheet Map 14).
- Mr. & Mrs. Meinzer wanted to know how close I1 was to their property at 17055 Boone Rd. in El Paso County. Upon review, it was 5.5. miles away from an alternative route I1. They live in eastern Kansas, since the route is an alternative and a few miles away from their land they will not travel to Colorado to a scoping meeting.

Public Involvement

- I am concerned about the proximity to my property, of course, unfortunately, I do not live in Colorado, so I cannot attend any of the meetings. I would greatly appreciate any notes, minutes of any on of the meetings.
- Please contact me about this project. Thank you, Bob Stewart 3-9066510.
- We will be at all meetings.
- It was stormy and we could not attend the meeting in Limon on Feb 13, but would like to attend any future meetings you have.
- No comments.
- Thank you for allowing us to give you input.
- We are gone to Canada for the summer June- Nov. Alberta phone is 403-627-1415.
- Please email all news.
- Sorry, we were not able to attend the meeting at Burlington.
- I am very sad about this situation. I cannot attend the meetings as I reside in Indiana.
- Our office represents Owl Canyon, LLC ("Owl Canyon") in regard to your letter recently received concerning the Eastern Plains Transmission Project ("EPTP").
- So that you are advised of the identity of our clients and are advised of at least some of their objections in their own words, we are enclosing copies of documents identifying the names and addresses of our clients, which, for the most part, include a summary of their objections and concerns to proposed Route J4.
- Representing John & Beth Craig SC405.
- Representing Barry Hollowell SC402.
- Representing Kim Hilferty SC395.
- Representing Harry Scherrer SC407.
- Representing Mary & Donald Peck SC394.
- Representing Bernard Hollowell SC403.
- Representing Margaret Schmidt SC397.
- Representing Agnes Wilkerson SC396.
- Representing Clay Monks SC406.
- Representing Larry & Grace Skinner SC400.
- Representing Timothy Andersen SC393.
- Representing Steven Norris SC390.
- Representing Beth Craig SC190.

Public Involvement

- Representing Shondell & Kevin Peck SC401.
- Representing Gorden Hollowell SC392.
- Representing Kandice Schmidt SC398.
- Representing Mike and Julie Cook SC389.
- Representing Steve & Kathy Winkelman SC404.
- Representing Opal Skinner SC391.
- Representing Don Schmidt SC399.
- This letter is to inform you that we are property owners which received notice from Mr. T. Craig Knoell, EPTP Project Manager, advising that our property would be affected by the proposed J4 Transmission Line.
- It is our intent to pursue all avenues available, including legal, in objecting to the J4 Transmission Line.
- Holley, Polk, & Skinner Law Firm client.
- We were advised no information was available and there was no concern. This is an unacceptable answer to what appears to be a valid concern.
- I attended the informational meeting your group hosted in Limon, Colorado on 2/13/07, and requested information regarding data on health risks associated with living close to large power lines such as what is being proposed.
- Holley, Albertson, & Polk Lawfirm client.
- Holley, Albertson, & Polk Lawfirm client.
- Holley, Albertson, & Polk Law Firm client.
- Holley, Albertson, & Polk Law Firm client.
- Holley, Albertson & Polk Law Firm client.
- Holley, Albertson & Polk Law Firm Client.
- Holley, Albertson, & Polk Law Firm client.
- Holley, Albertson & Polk Law Firm client.
- Holley, Albertson, & Polk Law Firm client.
- Holley, Albertson, & Polk Law Firm client.
- Holley, Albertson, and Polk Law Firm clients.
- Holley, Albertson, & Polk Law Firm client.
- Holley, Albertson, & Polk Law Firm client.
- Holley, Albertson, & Polk Law Firm client.

Public Involvement

- Holley, Albertson & Polk Law Firm client.
- Holley, Albertson & Polk Law Firm client.
- Holley, Albertson, & Polk Law Firm client.
- Holley, Albertson & Polk Law Firm client.
- Thank you in advance for making this change and if there is any way that we can of further assistance to you, please let us know at 719-583-6535.
- Our records indicated that your agency is providing us with literature through the US Postal Service, addressed to Commissioner Matt Peulen. Please make this name change as follows: TOL JE Chostner, Pueblo County Commissioner, 215 W. 10th Street, Pueblo, Colorado 81003-2992.
- I just received the latest information packet on the Eastern Plains Transmission Project. It reached my office late as it had an incorrect address on it. Please update your files on the Victor H. Hallman Trust to the following: Victor H. Hallman Trust, C/O Peoples Bank and Trust, Attention: John Knipp, 610 E. 30th, Hutchinson, KS 67502 Thank you for your assistance in this matter.
- I received a map and a note about this project today. I am not aware of the details of this project or if it impacts our property. I can not tell from the map that was included in our package. Also, I can not download the map from your website.
- We were never notified about this project in the summer or fall of 2006 and did not know anything those meetings.
- The first notice I received was in November or December 2006 (after the fact) and I immediately sent you an email. I never received a reply.
- We live at 13455 Harback Rd, Bennett Co- 3 miles west of Highway 79 at 136th Ave. Would someone please respond to this email and let me know where this project is relation to our property?
- I would request that you forward me several maps of the proposals through the area.
- While I am the Managing General Partner of Schmisseeur Farms of Kansas, LP, my 89 year old father owns a substantial interest. I would like to be able to show it to him. He does not have computer access, and my computer is not capable of printing something he could read. My father lives in Troy, IL. Would it be possible to print off a larger map as you emailed me and FedEx it to him ASAP. I will be there this weekend for our annual LP meeting. His mailing info is: LR Schmisseeur, 201 Liberty Square Dr, Troy, IL 62294.
- If you could get it sent out overnight to he and I both by tomorrow it would be much appreciated. My address for courier service is: Judge Robert Schmisseeur, Pratt county Courthouse, 3rd and Ninnescah Streets, Pratt, KS 67124. Thank you, I promise to be as cooperative as landowners ever are on this sort of thing.

Public Involvement

- Regarding the proposed electrical transmission lines which cross County Roads 7 and 2A, about one and one half miles west of my ranch.
- Dale Stull – property near Lamar, east of Fountain and north of Big Sandy; no specific comments (generally avoiding).
- Glen Arp – K Road and Highway 71; questions about RI/TVI; prefers alternative to the east; asked question about literature sent out defining “corridor” as 3-miles wide.
- Group – need meeting in Yoder/Calhan area with all landowners; should follow existing line; those people bought and built next to existing line (Section 25, T14SR62W; alternative on state land ¼ to ½ mile south would be okay).
- Ronald Merrifield – Sunnyville Heights subdivision proposed; three 10-acre lots; everything is covered in information sent out; excited to have power come into Wray.
- Norbert Pekarek – there are no alternatives on his land; he has no concerns with the project; he pointed out grain bins on 55 Road (Paconic Road), 1 ½ mile south of K Road.
- Kevin Turecek – wants to receive all future mailings.
- Brouwer – T8SR50W, Section 18; did not receive notice; is on mailing list – Donald and Dianna Brouwer, 23605 County Road 6, Flagler, CO 80815 – mail aerial photo of property and alternative (called Jennifer Chester – she will mail).
- Joe Kalcevic – office (303) 644-3443; cell (303) 601-4654 (LK needs to call?).
- Warren Fox – what are the effects of the project? (talked with Bob Pearson).
- I appreciate the information provided, the open meetings and the opportunity to provide comments.
- What is the purpose of notifying landowners who are not directly affected by the project [within the 3 mile notification corridor width].
- I am impressed with the quality and quantity of the information presented at the meetings.
- He also stated that somewhere in the information he received it mentions "landowners could call to set up a meeting." He is waiting for a response.
- We met with Ms. Crown from 1000 to 1215. Following are her concerns in no particular order:
- Mr. Neil Howell who tenant farms his Mother's property and land held by the Irlene Richardson Trust (legal descriptions below).
- Please keep these concerns in mind when you are choosing a route. Thank you.
- I am writing to address several concerns I have with the route, or proposed route for the new power line through Northern Kearny County, KS.
- I would be glad to show you around the property and give you an up close and personal tour. My phone number is 719-541-4400. Thank you for considering this change.

Public Involvement

- Mr. Brantley posed some questions that he felt the project would need to consider and respond to.
- The committee will meet on Friday March 9, 2007 to discuss options and issues related to the proposed route. The comments and options will be mailed to Western on Monday March 11, 2007. I agreed that we would consider the comments, although the end of the formal comment period is March 9 (i.e. comments postmarked March 9).
- It is a "sham" to not have more precise maps! I could not go to the Limon meetings due to a medical emergency. As I read the proposals to put a power generation plant west of Garden City, powered by coal, The Plan seems to be "flawed".
- With the proposed Eastern Plains Transmission Project maps in front of me, I cannot tell if the proposed lines go across my irrigated land or where they go. These are such vague maps that I don't know if I need to object or try to correct a line route that I can live with.
- I appreciate the courtesy and thoughtfulness of your staff. I realized at this last meeting that my concerns were heard at the Fountain 2006 meeting. This has been a much different approach than that taken by Excel [sic] or the proposed toll road coming thru our area.
- Some of my neighbors received large maps prior to the last set of meeting. I would like to request one of the J11 to J5 areas.
- Thank you for listening. I appreciate the time and trouble of Craig returning my phone calls last fall. I also appreciate the kindness of your real estate person. I am sorry I can't remember the name- just the face.
- Mr. Everett phoned because he wanted to let us know he was very opposed to a line being on his property.
- I emailed a comment form to him as he was having trouble using the online comment form on the website.
- We understand the need for additional capacity in our area's power grid. But as our land is already home to one 230 KV line (an existing Tri-State power line from Big Sandy to Beaver Creek), we would request some consideration in the planning of these new routes. I'll outline our property involvement for each new route below.
- We would be glad to discuss these concerns with a member of your staff, or tour the impacted area if that would be helpful. Thank you for taking time to hear our concerns.
- Further, I would appreciate any technical information as to the transmission line proposed and follow-up in either an email or writing as to the footprint dimensions of the proposed line, and the projects period of performance to include all phases of the project.
- As I stated in my telecon with Jim, my wife and I were surprised that we were potentially affected by subject project. The attachment to your letter did not indicate that the line that was imposed on the attachment, north of our property line, was not identified as a proposed Transmission line. Jim was especially helpful in answering questions regarding the dimensions of the tower footprint and the exposure of the high line to the property as measured from the centerline.

Public Involvement

- On this date I have had several telephone conversations with your office. Mr. Jim Uthe was especially helpful in clarifying some questions regarding the project.
- Again, thank Mr. Uthe for the courtesy he extended and his helpful information.
- Mr. Goering called because he received a packet in the mail and he was having a difficult time determining from the map included how close the routes were to his property. He provided his legal description (Sections 7, 8, 9, T21S, 37W; Sections 11, 12 T21S, 38W) and I mailed him aerial maps of those sections as well as Sheet Map 46 and a comment form.
- Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments, and please don't hesitate to contact me directly if you have any questions. In the meantime, please add me to the mailing list for the project and direct all future communications to the Frost Livestock Co. to this office.
- These scoping comments for the Eastern Plains Transmission Project are submitted on behalf of Frost Livestock Co. ("Frost Livestock"), a Colorado family corporation formed on January 26, 1962 by Jon and Mary Frost. The principal business address for Frost Livestock Co. is 183530 Hanover Road, Pueblo, CO 81008. Frost Livestock owns private land that could be impacted by the Boone Substation to Midway Substation segment of the Transmission Project. Frost Livestock also leases public land for grazing purposes in the vicinity of the proposed transmission lines. Frost livestock strongly objects to the location of any electrical transmission lines or related facilities on its private property.
- Mrs. Henderson wants to set up a meeting to go over maps and other information related to the project. She asked to speak to someone regarding the date and time a meeting could be set up.
- I think you would find much less opposition to your projects if you weren't putting in the biggest lines money can buy/ or bury them underground.
- Mr. Howard had trouble identifying routes on the map he was sent, asked for sheet maps 11 and 12 to be sent to him.
- I know it is going to be a big project but would like to know where to start to inform people of our situation here on Sanborn Rd in Yoder, CO. and get some clarification on the routes. Thanks for your time and look forward to hearing from you Thanks for you service to our community. The Howards.
- Don Howard here we live @ 29970 Sanborn Rd and are concerned with the proposed Transmission line project. It appears that the lines will be in close proximity to our home and about three other on Sanborn Rd. I would like to find out how to get more clarification on where these lines might go.
- Mr. Howard phoned because he had filled out a comment form and wanted to know when the questions he wrote on it would be answered. I informed him that not all questions written on the comment form are answered so he expressed his concern that the proposed route was skirting his property according to the map on the website. Because it was hard to judge from that map, I looked up his property information, (section 30, T14S, R61W) and told him I would email an aerial map so he could determine how close the proposed route actually was to his property.

Public Involvement

- I would like more information concerning my questions above to include but not limited to a more detailed route or map of the transmission line along Sanborn Rd.
- I have received a few maps from WAPA and from our meeting @ the Meeks residence last Friday night.
- We recently received a letter that stated that the eastern plains transmission lines are slated to go through our place. I know that everyone need electricity.
- Our concerns are related to the above land listing see attached sheet for a list of our concerns.
- I don't need all 30 pages Just need to know if you are going with J4, J3, or J1.
- We have contacted many public (sic) officials, news papers (with out much success) FOX-21 news did interview us and gave air time last night (3-09-07) we also had a neighborhood meeting with a large attendance.
- Any help would be greatly appreciated, suggestions on how we can work with these larger companies, thank you for any direction. Lori Meek.
- To whom it may concern, my name is Lori Meek and I am in the corridor of the Eastern Plains Transmission Project. My neighbors and myself have been trying very hard to come up with alternate routes, many were not even aware of the project.
- My issues are addressed in the accompanying letter, also faxed to the office—thank you for your consideration and time. Sorry about the primitive typewriter—due to my situation and medical needs a computer is not possible for my use/ in my home at this time—thanks!
- I could not attend meetings due to housebound status—as resident in special situation on Robert Paul's property in Rush—therefore am submitting comments etc. By mail/fax... thanks.
- Send 11x17 sheet map #7.
- I already sent by certified mail my personal comment form. However I felt the special circumstances on my property necessitated also emailing a portion of my comments-- as on my form they were possibly not written clearly enough to have communicated well.
- I have summarized both pertinent issues in my two previous answers, However, I ask again that you take into consideration of the needs of the special/ medical/ documented situation on my property.
- Worried it go through Sect, Twn Rng 35-4-56 Desc NE 1/4 of this section.
- Mr. Shimon phoned because the map we sent him did not cover his property. I clarified that his property coordinates were Section 35, T4S, R56W and he corrected that it was section 35, T4N, R56W. I apologized that we sent the wrong map and I forwarded him the correct one.
- Mr. Shimon would like an aerial map of his property that would show the proximity of the proposed route in relation to his property. Mr. Shimon also sent in a comment form that stated he planned to put a sprinkler on his farm.
- I attended all three meetings in Limon in summer and fall of '06 and Feb '07.

Public Involvement

- I did not write on the sheet maps. There was no reason for me until Feb. J4 had been substantially changed by then from what I saw last fall. I asked questions and made comments to staff members then.
- Unable to attend meeting in Limon, We received the wrong map in the mail (map 11)- The map that covers our property is Map 7.
- Mr. Thurlow phoned because he was concerned that the transmission line may affect conservation easements.
- They have in Colorado and Western Kansas. He provided the legal description of one of the properties in question (Section 23, T11S, R41W) and asked that I email him an aerial map of that section so that he could better determine if the line may affect their easement. He also asked about shape file and I told him I would have to look into if we have any that we could send out. He said that the aerial map should be sufficient.
- I hope you are still able to consider my comments. Various obligations kept me busy until Friday night, and I thought I could email my input and still be within the deadline. However, I was unable to access the address that is listed on your form. I will follow the format you provided.
- No one with the EASTERN PLAINS Transmission Project seems to care so we are asking for help and think we should have been notified sooner. I am enclosing copies of a comment form and maps where we think it should go.
- This we will fight "maturly" [sic] even w/ this deadline of March 9. You will continue to receive input we need added time to respond- you have had years of warning of this project in the works. We have not- had we, we might possibly have sold then.
- Jim Hartman- I do so appreciate your meeting with me. As I told you we are going to fight this with all. We can acquire- info- media- (sic)- local and federal legislations- Neighbors are helping. Flyers, website, we are researching to educate (for both sides) I know the electricity is needed just feel that (knowing of the more open areas. I can be routed through far away from homes.
- Please keep us fully informed as possible.
- Meeting went well- Not enough and/or adequate notice given to areas effected i.e.: many people not notified- need more time to respond & notify all.
- Mrs. Porter phoned because she could not determine how close the proposed route actually was to her property from the map she received. I told her we could send her out an aerial map that would show exactly how close the proposed route actually was. She provided her property coordinates (N 1/2 section 19, sections 17, 18, 7, 8, 9, 1, 2, 12 T3S, R54W) and stated she was concerned that the line would be right next to her house. She also asked that I send her a comment form.
- This is upsetting me due to not being contacted about this.
- I feel this is not a very important power line to come across our land. I had not been notified at all.
- We need more time please.

Public Involvement

- Please send all correspondence to my 3 sisters also they have an interest in this also.
- Our address is 31225 Sanborn Rd. Yoder, CO 80864. Our phone number is 719-478-5730 (no email). We would welcome a call or a visit so we can discuss this situation.
- We who live our here are in a state of shock due to the extremely short notice we have received. Until about a month ago we had no idea such a project was being planned. Please take more time to carefully consider the impact this project would have on us.
- We are writing concerning the proposed construction in the Yoder area of a high-voltage power line by Western Area Power Administration (docket # 07D-014E).
- Why don't you have panel discussion & question and answers at a set time so the whole group hear what is being said?
- Along with my opinions on the comment form, I wanted to include a formal letter expressing my concerns about the alternative route.
- Please take my thoughts into consideration during your decision time. Thank you for your time.
- He was aware that a group of landowners in the area was organizing, and he had been in contact with Mr. Harry Brantley.
- I explained that despite the end of the comment period, nothing in that area is final at this time. It is our intention to continue to work with the landowners in the area to find an appropriate and acceptable route.
- He seemed pleased to hear that we are listening and are open to feasible solutions. He plans to work with Mr. Brantley and will call me if he has other questions or concerns.
- I spoke with Mr. Howard on 3/13 and found he was concerned about J4 as it enters the Bohart Ranch. He wanted an explanation for why the proposed route jogged to the north and then back to the west in that area, only to eventually cross state land anyhow. At the time, I didn't have a good map to show the area of his concern. I offered to find the answer and call him back on 3/14.
- Thank you for sharing this information. Yes, please keep me update.
- Along with the package I am sending to you is a comment form and letter w/documentation from a lady that we would very much so like to avoid with the line routing. She has a medical condition that you should be aware of. Her legal description and location is included in that package.
- Jim. I do thank you for allowing me to speak freely with you. I truly mean no offense to any individual. I am, as I said. Speaking freely. And defending my family and rights I hope that we can continue this through out this process. Communication is very important. Especially open communication. I am leaving now to send this package by Fed-Ex. That Lee was considerate enough to furnish payment for.
- Can you please keep me as informed as allowed as to if I am helping or need to send more. If I think anything else I will fax it ASAP.

Public Involvement

- Thank you, once again for at least listening and looking at the suggestions we have to offer. We would still like more time as others were given ahead of us to research and offer alternatives. And whether the company allows this past the deadline given of March 9, 2007 or not. We intend to continue to submit more. We will dispute this choice of routing, continually with all of our energies and resources. From elected officials to new media. Inundating them with all we can.
- I am hoping that these suggested routes that I am sending are of some help. You and your staff can alter and/or fine tune them to maybe come up with an alternative that we can all, or mostly all live with. Do not hesitate to contact me with ANY questions.
- He uses 2 way radios and they already are interfered with along the Xcel Holcomb to Lamar 345 kV line that was recently built.
- Ernie had called WAPA on February 21, 2007 about concerns with radio interference and effects on his organic farming practices from the proposed EPTP project. I (Bob Pearson) called Ernie on February 22nd to discuss his concerns.
- Ernie asked if he would have similar problems with the new line and I said that we had understood that his Motorola radios were similar to those other farmers had problems with along the Xcel line.
- I have enough interference with my 2-way radios, noise, AM radio and field obstructions to need anymore.
- They are also concerned about radio and GPS interference since they use both technologies on their site.
- The electromagnetic radiation generated by transmission lines has been documented to interfere with the operation of this type of equipment and that type of interference will further adversely impact active farmland use of property under and in the vicinity of the powerlines.
- Active farming activity also includes the use of automatic sprinklers and sophisticated machinery which includes global positioning systems, electronics, and sophisticated computerized equipment.

Radio or Television Interference

- Effect on cell phone/ radio/ TV-satellite/computers (internet).
- Electro magnetic field giving out by transmission lines- A. Messing with Sat. GPS posing, B. Computers in farm machinery.
- I fear the presence of the proposed transmission lines will interfere with amateur radio transmission and reception to the west. Specifically the 2 meter band to Colorado Springs and vicinity and the 10, 15 and 20 meter bands to Asia, Australia, and New Zealand. Additionally, I suspect that local radio and TV reception will be adversely affected.
- Joe Ewertz – questions regarding 2-way radio interference and GPS interference.

Radio or Television Interference

- Norm Michal – Loose insulators on existing line; rattle all the time; cause interference (referred to Gary Mueller).
- Do not split the farmland along the north-south part of J4 How will the electrical lines affect the computer controls on machinery, for example the spraying controls on big sprayers?
- The line will interfere with cell phone reception, television, and radio.
- What effect will it have on communication, cell phones, radios, TV's, Computers.
- Radio and TV reception at our residence will be affected. Also we have concerns about door openers, cell phones, electric fences and barbed wire fences.
- What are the potential interferences with cell phone, radio, and/or GPS systems that could result from both the construction and continued operation of the transmission line?
- There is no doubt that this power line would have detrimental impacts on our health, the value of our land, and diminished re-sale values, not to mention the negative visual effects and electric interference with radio, television, etc.
- Ag tourism: Bird watchers, wildlife photographers, hunters and people who want to experience activities on a working ranch.
- We have urban visitors that enjoy the same view; hunters, bird watchers, wildlife photographers, and people who like to experience working ranch activities.
- Because this is residential grassland, this 1/2 section is used for family and recreational activities! (This is not grassland for grazing cattle.) People regularly ride horseback and hike on this property- it's basically an extended back yard.
- He has enjoyed hiking this area for years and would not want a "large ugly" transmission line destroying the views. He is very concerned with the visual impacts.
- He is an avid hiker who enjoys hiking the Bohart more than nearly any place within reasonable distance from his home. His favorite hike is off of Meyer's Rd. Approximately 2 miles N. to the top of a hill where he finds a beautiful view of nearly pristine open country (looking to the west, in particular) with views of the Spanish Peaks, Culebra range, Sangre Cristo Range, and North to the Rampart Range.
- Should the line be built through the ranch, the completed line and construction phase will definitely take away from the ambiance of our view, tranquility, ranch tour, trail riding and guest cattle drives.

Recreation

- An additional power line is definitely in opposition to the character of Craig Ranch Bed & Breakfast, LLC & Horse Motel. Direct quotes from our website that do not agree with the proposed power line follows: " Go with us in the pick up to check cattle, water, and fence. Bring your horse and enjoy horseback riding on our 15,000 acre ranch. Bring your camera and photograph wildlife."
- An additional power line is definitely in opposition to the character of Craig Ranch Bed & Breakfast, LLC & Horse Motel. Direct quotes from our website that do not agree with the proposed power line follows: " Our Colorado Ranch Property has interesting activities for everyone- from horseback riding (bring your horse), to private ranch hunting, to bird watching, to history and prairie appreciation."
- An additional power line is definitely in opposition to the character of Craig Ranch Bed & Breakfast, LLC & Horse Motel. Direct quotes from our website that do not agree with the proposed power line follows: "ride the range".
- An additional power line is definitely in opposition to the character of Craig Ranch Bed & Breakfast, LLC & Horse Motel. Direct quotes from our website that do not agree with the proposed power line follows: "bring your horse and ride the range. You might opt to relax in the hammock, gaze at the stars, or wander to the garden and pick a bouquet."
- "—Section 23, 22 of T2S R61W proposed L15 on W side of road 246 because location of center pivot irrigation and a home site.\ —L9 and L15 redraw 1/2 mile south in Section 31 T2S R60W because of location of windmill for stock tank, wildlife pond, and hunting club." Map 2.
- The Santa Fe Trail is a nationally known part of our heritage history.
- Using alternative A-5 comes very close to the trail by Syracuse.
- Ernest Hammer – routing questions in T15SR50W, Section 6; reroutes drawn on Sheet 20; concern with views; bird watcher, aesthetics; ranch sits high between Rush Creek and Big Sandy Creek; family is not happy.
- All of the predatory birds are protected by the US fish and wildlife service and these powerlines could cause a severe decline in their numbers when affecting our hunting preserve.
- The proposed power lines would affect my irrigation, water rights, hunting preserve business and hay business. It would cost me money to move the center pivots that I have had at these locations for 5 years on my land.
- Placing these on my land will be making it a danger to my clients to hunt in these areas due to hitting a power line with pellets or birds flying and getting tangled up in the power lines.
- These areas that you proposed to put the transmission power lines are my livelihood for both my hunting preserve and my hay and cattle business. The hay that is planted in the circles irrigation provides financial income for my family and feed for my own cattle and the stubble that is left after cutting is for my hunting preserve.

Recreation

- We are property owners living at 3110 S. Calhan Hwy. in Yoder, CO. We own and use the adjoining property to the north at 3010 S. Calhan Hwy. (our goal was to resurvey and combine the two parcels since we have plans to expand the buildings which span the lot line). It was brought to our attention today by a neighbor that your proposed power lines would be crossing our properties. Upon review of the map they scanned in and sent us, the lines and easements would go directly over our existing barn and outbuildings. Our home is within a few feet of this area. An easement road would potentially require demolition of our buildings.
- I am opposed to any transmission lines across my property of any magnitude. I am opposed to eminent domain. I am opposed to any unwanted easement by "anybody" including Eastern Plains Transmission Project/ Western Area Power Ad./ Department of Energy/ USA for both my properties in Elbert/Boone, Colorado.
- House. Property location: 4720 Mulberry, Yoder, CO 80864.

Residential

- Future residential and/or commercial development [damaged].
- Secondly, are you aware that the proposed 500 kV transmission line will travel near or over our existing residence? If indeed, it is not proposed to travel over our existing residence but instead, near it, I am greatly concerned about the negative impact it will have on my family's health. I would like much more empirical data regarding the health risks these high voltage lines impose.
- My name is Angela Curtis and I reside at 2990 Lauppe Rd., Yoder, Colorado 80864.
- Just asking that power lines not go over our homes!
- House is about 1/2 mile from proposed F7.
- Legal description of my residence is SWSE Sec 12 T85 R53W.
- Pleased with the proposal to build the new 500 kV line parallel with the existing 230 kV line. Burlington to Big Sandy impact would be minimal if this route is chosen. My residence was directly underneath the original proposal last September. Please don't put the line on CR3N.
- [G5] less impact on residential homes.
- A lot of houses along 71 Rd are vacant and probably won't be occupied
- H2- T4S R45W Sec. 25 Our house seems to be under the proposed line. See map 30 or 29 for proposal to move it.
- Has home directly under proposed route segment A7, two alternatives drawn.
- House directly under segment A7.
- [Heard about meeting from] mad neighbor.
- [Heard about meeting from] mad neighbor.
- Over the top of my place.

Residential

- My home, built in 1993, was positioned purposely for the south/southeast view of the Beaver Creek Valley. Large towers in that view would not be something we would desire. I am located east of Hwy 71 & South of County Rd. Q. Address is 29464 County Rd. Q, Brush. Thank you for your consideration here.
- Ownership change: Deone & Connie Hudson T15S, R40W, S29, a portion of NE 1/4.
- T25S R36W Sec23, 25, 36. Route A2. Homes (3) near route. Possibility of moving if not other way. (3 of them) + elec, sewer, etc.
- Property SE corner near Tribune, KS & W 1/2 T18S R40W Section 27.
- 22S, 34W, S30.
- I am not particularly concerned about the line crossing my property.
- Own property on sections 31-23-34, 32-23-34, 29-23-34, 20-23-34, 19-23-34, 18-23-34. Have house on 32-23-34 and 18-23-34.
- Have concerns on two houses and tenants that live there.
- My house in Sec 13 T2S 35W.
- More residences along A1 than are shown on maps. Fewer residences on A2 in that area. (David Goertzen is my name).
- I prefer A2 over A1. A1 affects my son's proposed home site (Ryan Goertzen) Sec 12 T25S 36W.
- Ts22-SR-36 West.
- Concern- Kiowa County 25-18-43 Where it jogs across NE25 it comes very close to our house (3 houses).
- This would move the line away from the close proximity to the Tony Hammer residence located near Road M in the S half of section 6, township 15 S, Range 50 W.
- Segment J4, Map 9, T11S, R 56W, Sec 3 SW 1/4 is home and other buildings.
- More homes exist that need to go on map.
- Fessinger road over to state land would miss a lot of home owners.
- I just identified my house 1.1 miles east of Yoder Road on North side of Sanborn Rd.
- My main concern is with the proposed route. I didn't want it on Sanborn Road. It would literally be in my front yard.
- T14S, R62W, S33, NE of NE is location.
- Over her house (J7).
- The J-6 and J-7 routes are very close to a populated trailer park.
- From the maps it appears to impact less homes than the J-10 routes.
- Therefore, I feel it is important to avoid as many homes and populated areas as possible.

Residential

- On map 39, 14 south, 40 west, north 1/2 32 sect. is the location.
- Because this is residential grassland, this 1/2 section is used for family and recreational activities! (This is not grassland for grazing cattle.) People regularly ride horseback and hike on this property- it's basically an extended back yard.
- B13 will be less "offensive" in the Western Kansas area because it travels through open pasture for cattle, away from residences.
- Alternative Route L12 cuts across US Hwy 36 through section 36, Township 3 south, Range 61 west. Section 36 has been subdivided into 17-35+ acres sites. 14 of those sites is recorded with Adams county as Evergreen Country Estates- 6 of those 14 sites are either under contract or sold.
- That alternative route on both sides of Hwy 36 just east of Byers affects many other existing homes or land in the process of being developed for home sites or planned to be in the near future & will definitely cause problems and dispute.
- Two properties 100 yr homesteads one has site of Belview [sic] school house (one room).
- L-12/L-11 Absolutely not wanted at all it will pass through my family farm of 110 years.
- It also passes too close to to [sic] many homes.
- My land is one of the few pieces of property to still be in the hands of the family that homesteaded it. We have had to see land around us developed into houses to ruin Gods creation don't force a powerline over it too.
- On sheet map #2, in purple marker, "suggested reroute for study". Suggested re-route would cross far fewer landowners, would be avoiding population, would be crossing undeveloped land and land that has little potential to be developed (no water to support development) would simplify the route-fewer towers (corners).
- It would be best to keep it away from the majority of the population.
- Why protect homes but not businesses.
- Why move away from homes?
- Farther east would be better for everyone as few people live there and there is very little water to sustain a population.
- Our house is surrounded on 3 sides by your towers. There must be another way without destroying the 8 homes that are in this subdivision.
- The line to the east should be moved away from our homes. L22/M5 should be moved away from our homes. It should be moved farther east.
- My property is attached.
- Because alternate route would be on family homestead that is recognized by the state of Colorado & Colorado Historical Society as 100 year farm/ranch that has been in same family over 100 years.

Residential

- Please don't do this use the proposed rough [sic]. Dosnt [sic] go threw [sic] home's.
- Home. Manny [sic] kids across street about 10-13 kids show horses. Are on my land.
- Please consider L8 & L9 where there are no homes :).
- The changes made to the L2 section of the line is a much wiser idea due to the fact it would avoid a lot of our rough country (the breaks) and it also avoids many homes.
- I am asking to see the evaluation made as to environmental justice, land use- residential, economic values and visual resources as to the effect on my home site that are planned for the N 1/2, S-31, T-1N, R-63W.
- Lives at F & 34 roads, Morgan county.
- I am writing in regards to my property at 3005 Old Windmill View, Yoder, Colorado 80864.
- Why is the power line going through the properties and not along roadways or where there is not any development yet.
- I am not very pleased with the line going through my property and according to the map this line is going very close to my house and almost in the center of my property.
- Safety considerations with the power lines being in close proximity of homes.
- We have been advised about the proposed high voltage power line project which is projected to run through our property, directly alongside our home and barn.
- If that is completely impossible we are asking for help so that we can move our family someplace safer and to try once again to establish a permanent home for our kids.
- You must realize this will turn our quiet country home into an industrial area.
- Section 14-22-35 is our farm headquarters. This land has two homes livestock facilities and grain storage.
- With this in mind, my wife and I are planning to build our "dream" home at this site. Any consideration on your behalf pertaining to tower sites should/must be taken into consideration. Our property address is: 3885 Mulberry Rd. Yoder, CO 80864.
- As an owner of a residential building site in Evergreen Country Estates located in Section 36, T3S, R61W that the "L12" section of the line, even though it does not lie directly on my property, will be a great detriment to my building site investment for which I will be seeking full damage compensation and alternative routes.
- Sheet map 31 3) As C5 heads south, it should begin 1/2 mile earlier than proposed but stay in west half of sec. 12 & 13 to stay away from irrigation on sec. 14 and house as it travels further south.
- Sheet map 31 4) We are strongly opposed to C6 & C4 as they cross by nice houses and our feedlot and many irrigated parcels. Please contact me if you have questions as to our comments.

Residential

- I live at 10835 Grassland Rd, Colorado Springs, CO 80925. You have two tracks of towers, one steel and one wood, running through my subdivision. I have two concerns.
- I own property at Evergreen Estates which will directly be effected by your proposed route of L12 along the western subdivision edge.
- As an owner of a residential building site in Evergreen Country Estates located in Section 36. T3S R61W the "L12" section of the line, your proposed high voltage power line will be a great detriment to my building site investment for which I will be seeking full damage compensation.
- The alternate route is too close to housing already established.
- My property seems to be in the alternative route (33510 Big Springs Rd, Yoder, CO) how much land of ours do you need? Will we be reimbursed?
- Ren Tail, trailer & my home.
- The SE corner of the SE 1/4 of section 17-9-43 is my farm headquarters with shop facility, grain storage, livestock facilities, and most importantly my home.
- We pointed out the location of 8-10 houses in our neighborhood that were not already indicated on your map- they were marked by your staff members.
- At least two of these houses lie directly in the path of the proposed route and two more are very near. The map on the next page shows where the houses are located.
- Until recently we owned 1 1/2 sections of land southwest of Yoder, CO. The land has since been subdivided into 25 forty-acre units. All but 5 of these units have been sold, and we hope to sell the rest in the future.
- Our main concern is that the proposed route south of the Yoder area passes directly over our property within 1/2 mile of our house, but even worse, it passes almost directly over at least 5 of our neighbors' houses, See map attached next page.
- 15 of these units currently have houses on them and the others probably will in the near future. Most of these houses were not on your map.
- Would the presence of the lines make the property undesirable for residential development?
- We have a farmstead and some out buildings along CR 71 and our home base is along road 72 south of Plainview School.
- Just wondering how close the lines will come to occupied homes. Thanks so much.
- I feel another Route (other than J5) would be best being less populated.
- Route J5 where I'm located is mostly subdivided into forty acre parcels with a large number of homes, more are being built everyday.
- An additional power line is definitely in opposition to the character of Craig Ranch Bed & Breakfast, LLC & Horse.

Residential

- Motel. Direct quotes from our website that do not agree with the proposed power line follows: "simplicity of country ranch life".
- I made this suggestion at the meeting in Lakin and was told to put the idea on this form and send it in. To reduce cost and various landowner ill-will it would seem logical to use the one route going North out of Holcomb to the Burlington substation for both Lamar and Burlington.
- The proposed and alternate routes could be moved a short distance to avoid residences. Continuing segment B3 straight north would appear to avoid numerous residences.
- There is a residence in the NW 10-21-36 that serves a farm headquarters for Kuhlman Family Farms, LLC. This headquarters is complete with a 2,650 foot grass runway that is used for my personal aircraft. Construction of this transmission line across the South end of that runway would effectively eliminate my main access to my farm operation. Your use of the alternate route of B2, B3, B4, B9, B11, B14, B18, B20, B21 would remove this conflict.
- Follow routes that avoid residences. Moving the lines 1 1/2 miles south or 3 miles north would avoid a large number of private residences.
- "—Section 23, 22 of T2S R61W proposed L15 on W side of road 246 because location of center pivot irrigation and a home site.\ —L9 and L15 redraw 1/2 mile south in Section 31 T2S R60W because of location of windmill for stock tank, wildlife pond, and hunting club." Map 2.
- "Sections 36 & 29 of T3S R61W on alternative route L12. Identification of subdivided residential land. Evergreen country estates. Six lots are sold. 354-acre development." Map 2.
- "T7S R56W Sec. 27 — L1, grain bins Sec. 29 — (L2) Lester Malcom house Sec. 28, 29 — (L2) Two more structures labeled "Malcom" Map 7.
- "T9S R60W, Sec. 11, 12 — Red re-draw 1/2 mile east of N5, Sec. 12 — House drawn". Map 8.
- New home site and property identified on alternatives J1 & N4 on south side of I-70 T9S R57W Sec. 10, SW 1/4. Map 8.
- House identified north of alternate route J3 T10S R57W Sec. 11. Map 8.
- "Identified locations along the proposed F7 route including Section line, dam in seven mile creek, house, corrals, and steel shed in Sections 7 & 8 T11S R53W." Map 9.
- "Re-draw of J-10 route from Sec. 35 of T14S R62W east to 85 Rd in Sec. 36 T14S R62W, then south along Range line between R62W-R61W, then runs east to Boone Rd or Rd 575 and north until it rejoins J4 in Sec. 3 T14S R60W to avoid many homes that were marked." Map 11.
- "—Many homes identified to be an issue beneath alternative J5 route in subdivided Sections 23, 26, and 25 of T13S R61W.—Airport location identified along alternative route J5 Section 18 T13S R60W." Map 11.
- 8 homes identified near proposed J4 Section 31/32 of T14S R61W. Map 11.
- Corral, old coal mine, home identified; Section 32, 33 T14S R60W near proposed J4 route. Map 11.

Residential

- Identification of home sites/buildings south of proposed E6 in Sections 29 and 30 of T20S R54W. Map 16.
- Identification of Cage house/property Sections 34 and 35 T14S R52W near F5 alternative. Map 20.
- Two homesites identified in Sections 1 and 3 T16S R50W near alternative F5 route. Map 20.
- "—Identification of Witt property, Sec. 17 T8S R51W, south of the proposed G4 route.— Identification of Witt property feed lot and homesite under alternative route G3, Sections 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21 of T7S R50W." Map 22.
- "—Identification of two homesites in Sections 15 and 16 of T8S R49W just north of proposed G4 route.—Identification of solar water well in Sec. 16 T8S R49W under proposed G4 route." Map 22.
- B. Rueb new homesite identification. 23505 CR 4, Vona, CO 80861 in Sec. 14 of T8S R48W just south of proposed G4 route. Map 23.
- Identification of homesite, Sec. 16 of T8S R46W; Y.00 Rd and 33.00 Rd. south of proposed route. Map 23.
- Identification of homesite on 72 Rd. between proposed C5 and alternative C4 in Sec. 24 T19S R43W. Map 27.
- Two homes identified on AA Rd in Sec. 1 T2S R45W and identification of new homesite in Sec. 1 T2S R45W. Map 28.
- Sunnyville heights identified north of H4 proposed in Sec. 31 T2N R44W. Map 28.
- Homesites identified on AA Rd, Sec. 12 T4S R45W and Sec. 1 T4S R45W, east of proposed H2. Map 29.
- Identification of Wine Glass homesite 1871-5 in Sec. 25 T3S R45W; Fox Ranch to west of proposed H2, and McCoy Ranch to east of H2. Map 29.
- Re-draw of proposed H2 to avoid center pivots and homesite in Sections 25 and 36 of T4S R45W to run 1/2 mile east of proposed down the range line between R45W and R44W to 1/2 mile into Sec. 1 T5S R45W, then runs diagonally south of proposed H2 in Sections 6, 7 and 8 in T5S R44W until it meets original proposed H2 around 4 Rd and CC Rd in Sec. 17 T5S R44W and continues south. Map 30.
- Building and house identified in Sec. 35 T4S R45W. Map 30.
- Identification of 3 homesites/buildings under alternative G5 in Sec. 36 T8S R45W and Sec. 1 T9S R45W. Map 31.
- Identification of 3 homesites, Sections 17, 20, and 21 T9S R43W, under alt. C6-C2. "Do not want these alts." -- written by alt. C4. Map 31.
- Identification of homes in Sec. 19 T9S R42W and Sec. 35 T9S R43W, near proposed C5 line. Map 31.

Residential

- "Re-draw of proposed C5 line, Sections 24, 25, and 36 T9S R43W, along west and south section lines to avoid homesite, Sec. 36, and State land, Sec. 36 T9S R43W; rejoins original proposed in T10S R43W." Map 32.
- Homesite identified east of alt. C2, Sec. 18 T14S R43W. Map 33.
- Homesites identified near proposed C5, Sec. 7 T13S R42W and Sec. 20 T13S R42W. Map 33.
- Homesites and property boundaries identified near alt. B13 in Sections 7, 18, and 19 of T13S R36W; prefer to move line west 2.5 miles—no re-draw. Map 40.
- Identified Pauline Fecht's property and unoccupied home near proposed B11 in Sections 27 and 28 in T18S R40W. Map 43.
- Sec. 6, 7, 16 — Re-drew line (A2) to be further west; 3 houses in Section 16. Map 49.
- "T25S R36W Sec. 31, 32 — Houses drawn Sec. 32 — NW corner, "check previous maps". Map 49.
- "T25S R35W Sec. 20, 21 — Tri-State line drawn T25S 33W Sec. 5, 8 — A1 re-draw further east by 1/2 mile T24S R33W Sec. 17, 18 — Re-draw of B1 T24S R34W Sec. 24 — Proposed disposal site (B1) T23S R34W Sec. 19, 29, 30, 32 — Circled locations of oil wells, hay mill, and houses T24S R36W Sec. 32 — Re-draw and circled residences". Map 49.
- 61461 St. Rd. 71 identified homesite near alternatives G6 and K2 T7S R55W Sec. 28 (Rd 27 and 3S Rd). Map 7.
- Do not move any closer to house.
- We have developed sections 12 & 13 for residential use "35 acres" this project will destroy our land values for selling these lots.
- Investment/ future home site.
- New line interfering with existing residences, buildings.
- We believed we had a secure building site (this will be our house we want to raise our family in & live for the rest of our lives).
- In building where we did, we felt that we were safe in that we were over 1/4 (closer to 1/2) mile from the current transmission lines.
- When we began preliminary phases of construction on our home, we would not have built in that location had we known about this project.
- The proposed route is less than 1/4 mile from our residential property. As we are just completing construction of our new home located on section 14, 8S, 48W, we are VERY concerned about the proposed corridor.
- We would entertain (sic) the idea of moving them (trailers) 1 mile south to any other corner (sec. 23-25-36) if it would be cost neutral to us.

Residential

- Re: sec 23-25-36 Kearny County Ks. One of your proposed routes will go over the corner of NW23-25-36 on which we have 3 trailer homes which are used as homes or storage.
- Sheet map 31 4) We are strongly opposed to C6 & C4 as they cross by nice houses and our feedlot and many irrigated parcels. Please contact me if you have questions as to our comments.
- Sheet map 31 3) As C5 heads south, it should begin 1/2 mile earlier than proposed but stay in west half of Sections 12 & 13 to stay away from irrigation on Sec. 14 and house as it travels further south.
- NW & N 1/2 S 1/2 15-7-47.
- I have owned this property since 1970 when my husband was stationed at Fort Carson before being sent to Vietnam. I have held it all these years to build my retirement home there.
- I will retire within the next 2 years and I am concerned that it will interfere with my property and my view, as well as the value of the land.
- A family lives in and upon Owl Canyon Property. Cattle are also being raised in such area. Clearly, submitting a family and livestock to this amount of kilovolts is an unacceptable health risk.
- The impacted residences and business will decline in value, as there will be adverse impacts on the use from these homes.
- This office has been engaged to represent numerous property owners with farms, residences, businesses, and property holdings along the proposed J4 electrical transmission line route from the Midway substation to the Big Sandy substation, part of the Eastern Plains Transmission Project.
- Proposed Route J4, as it runs from Limon south to a point approximately 13 miles south of Limon, then turns southwesterly, directly impacts at least ten (10) residences and one (1) bed and breakfast business.
- The proposed J4 route should be rejected because of its adverse impact on numerous residences and at least one business.
- In addition and equally important, while the scientific studies relative to health impacts resulting from proximity to high voltage transmission lines may not be conclusive one way or another, there is certainly a public perception that it is undesirable to have a home and to reside in close proximity to electrical transmission facilities and there is a mark of stigma which diminishes the value of homes in proximity to such facilities.
- My two greatest concerns are: Devaluation and salability of my property.
- Our son and his family live in the area in question and our first concern would be possible adverse health effects and loss of property.
- This effects [sic] our family, friends, and neighbors who live in these areas. We are concerned about adverse health issues, property values.

Residential

- I have concerns about my grandchildren growing up around power poles, because of the health risks that are coming out on kids who live close to power poles, Cancer concerns for one. There are already test being done on adults who lived under power poles.
- Alternative suggestions to proposed Route J4: Since Western must acquire easement/right of way for the 230kV line from Big Sandy substation to 125 mile substation (N1, N2, N3, or N4), could that also accommodate the 500 kV line that must go to Midway? That line then could proceed from 125 mile south and connect with J3/J5 to reach midway. Less easement acquisition, less farmland, more rangeland, sparsely settled.
- Alternative suggestions to proposed Route J4: If the above suggestion is not possible, then please reconsider alternative routes J1 or J3/J5. Those routes both cross less farmland and more rangeland that does J4, through sparsely settled areas. Lower acquisition costs, lower damage and loss of production claims.
- loss of a lifestyle.
- We just built our house a year and a half ago. We specifically purchased the property because it was not near any high power lines, road, etc.
- John Thatcher – need to check ownership of chemical depot property; concern with how project would affect his lifestyle.
- Group – need meeting in Yoder/Calhan area with all landowners; should follow existing line; those people bought and built next to existing line (Section 25, T14SR62W; alternative on state land ¼ to ½ mile south would be okay).
- Ronald Merrifield – Sunnyville Heights subdivision proposed; three 10-acre lots; everything is covered in information sent out; excited to have power come into Wray.
- Ryan Weaver (Group) – move preferred alternative from Burlington to Energy Center ½ mile west south of K Road; Paconic Road is main road for planting and harvest; most activity in July and September; grain bins discussed; also close to house on east side of 55 Road (Roger Cleavanaugh ?).
- Matt Witt: There is a center pivot, feed lot, house, and farmland. T7S R50W, 17, 18, 19, 20.
- Jacob Wagers: We have grain bins, and a homestead near K-11, Along E Road—25 road and E road.
- I prefer K-10 route over K-11. My house is less than ¼ mile from the route on K-11. Also, my parents have a house within about 1 mile south of where k-11 turns to the east.
- There are 10-12 homes that you are going to impact.
- You are too close to homes in this area.
- Mr. Mitcheck called about the letter he received (ROE) and states the route in question is too close to his house, if we moved it a bit he'd feel better about the situation. Sec. 25 SE 1/4 35, T15S, R43W, Sec. 1, W 1/2 12 T46S, R43W.

Residential

- Mr. Garrett Mitchek has requested Western keep our line 1/2 mile from his house. Attached is a map showing the line, his house, and his property. He is happy to cooperate with us provided we can accommodate his request.
- Why can you not involve people houses and property and move your construction in open fields that it will not affect families' lifestyle.
- If this was built in the area would you move to it? Why?
- The fact that people live right in that area, This is going into area's of new growth.
- Why can't this be moved to more open areas along Hwy 71 and into open area that the land is open not populated with people?
- Although it is not shown on the maps I looked at, there is a house on Section 11. This house is located in the southwest corner. Approx 1/4 mile east of CR 125 and near Hwy 86. If the line splits section 11 in half, the homesite will be within 1/4 mile of the line.
- Please consider putting the 230kV line on the section line between section 11 and section 12. This would not have any effect [sic] on the overall direction of the line, it would move the line away from the homesite in Sec. 11 and any new land wouldn't have a transmission line going right across it.
- Another suggestion is to continue J4 SE to run east of the State Land and hook up with the I1 alternative to head into Midway; There may be an opportunity to minimize impacts to residences by following J6 and parts of J7, then heading east to go north of Yoder, the turning south before getting to Rush and getting back to J5, or perhaps continuing east to the south of Rush and heading east to hit J4.
- Why would the Project look for reroutes to avoid houses in some areas, but not others?
- There is at least one foster home located along the north part of State Land which the line would impact; there is another foster home that is located almost directly under the proposed line.
- Mr. Brantley provided some preliminary alternative routes that he feels would reduce the overall impact of the route to homes, in general.
- Jim Hartman and Mr. Brantley met in Aurora to discuss the proposed routing of J4 as it nears the State Land in T14S R61W. Mr. Brantley and other homeowners in the area are forming a Committee to help identify options to the proposed route J4 and its location in proximity to houses and subdivided areas surround the State land. Mr. Brantley mentioned State Representative Loofer in conjunction with the committee, but I was unclear as the Representative Loofer's potential role.
- Why would the project reroute for a gun club, but not residences?
- I truly hope you can avoid as much residential area as possible- especially my own home.
- An alternative route is near his property and he has great concerns as he is building a house on it and has young children that he worries about because of health concerns.

Residential

- If proposed route K9 is chosen then we would request a change in its route. Specifically we would suggest that it make its turn at T4S/ R55W/ S35 (three miles to the north of where proposed). This would allow both lines to cross the public road at the same place, reducing its visual impact, and in addition would avoid some of the rougher terrain encountered in Township 5S. There would also not be homes, farmsteads or driveways along a more northern route.
- Alternate Route L1: Big Sandy to Green Valley: This 345 kV line would follow the existing 230 kV Tri-State line north of Limon and split at the south edge of our property, crossing on a diagonal through the heart of the F Cross Ranch (see enclosed map). We support Proposed route L2, which bypasses our property to the west.
- As an administrator of the school district impacted by the current projected path of the project, I am concerned that I will lose both staff and students who will move to avoid the power lines. We are the 16th smallest district in Colorado and very isolated. Students and quality staff are vital to the district. I believe the route should be re routed to a less populated area.
- The criteria developed by the Western Area Power Administration to evaluate potential locations for electrical transmission lines, as described in the January 2007 Transmission Project newsletter, unfairly discriminates against historic agricultural lands in favor of more recent residential developments and land uses.
- Ranch workers live in several homes on the property.
- Finally, additional power lines and related facilities will increase electromagnetic fields on the ranch, creating the potential for harm to wildlife, livestock and area residents.
- Ironically, it is the more recent residential land uses that both create the need for additional power transmission capacity and benefit from such facilities, while the burdens are borne by long-term ranching families that have protected their land from outside intrusions and encroachments for generations.
- The 1 mile corridor is quite a vague concept for someone that only owns 35 acres. As you can imagine the one mile corridor may mean a mile away from my home which would be good or right through my property not so good.
- Don Howard here we live @ 29970 Sanborn Rd and are concerned with the proposed Transmission line project.
- It appears that the lines will be in close proximity to our home and about three other on Sanborn Rd. I would like to find out how to get more clarification on where these lines might go.
- The transmission line J4 runs parallel with Sanborn Rd approximately 1/2 to 3/4 of a mile south of Sanborn Rd. Just before it intersects with the J8 transmission Line it makes a northward jog on to or near Sanborn Rd and continues to travel west. This jog appears to travel across the southwest corner of our property. I am concerned about this due to the fact that it encroaches on to our property but will also cut across numerous homes on the North side of Sanborn Rd.
- My wife and I moved to Kansas in 1977 and just retired three years ago thinking we would spend a little time on the ranch. With the electric line there we would not do that.

Residential

- Very close to our residence and rental.
- Our residence is located in the NW corner of section 3-11-56 & we own and farm the entire section.
- Our residence is very close.
- There will be a decline in value of our residence and our farm ground.
- The proposed J4 line runs approximately 1/4 mile from our farmstead including our residences and a rental mobile home. We have many concerns about the line being that close.
- In this area you have 9 residences near this line. Looking at your maps J4 does not impact that many residences.
- The route should stay about 10 miles east of Byers, CO as it runs N & S to avoid a higher population density.
- The proposed route is OK for, one of the alternative routes that runs the line just east of Byers goes through not only a development of ours but also several 40 acre lots with existing houses.
- As noted on page one, (sec. 36, 35, 61W) is a platted development with several sites sold and built on. The alternative route goes through this property, as well as existing development. The route should stay as proposed crossing Highway 36 (going North and south) approximately 10 miles east of Byers.
- Due to medical conditions, I am housebound and live under very different conditions than most individuals. The dwelling I live in--- took years to construct and cure and set up as non-toxic and non-metal (non conductive) and is built INTO the hill, unmovable on the land.
- Would you try to work with me, to go around me by a few more miles to make it possible for me to survive and continue to progress? I know you must do SOMETHING... but if you would try to avoid me by slightly more distance (given I live away from even small power lines) this would be a great help to me. I live with minimal voltage, no electromagnetic devices/appliances... (sic) to health complications from these incitants already.
- Mr. Paul—the landowner on whose land my special dwelling resides—has already communicated these ideas and thoughts. My own in regard to my needs are in the attached letter and inside page comments—If you could help, by avoiding me—and this special situation by a few more miles this would be a great assistance to my continued recovery/ survival...
- Robert Paul's land (NE 1/4 of section 4 T- 15S, R60W)--- which is at Gieck and Whittemore in Rush, CO--- is land used to provide safe/medically sound housing/ circumstances for me. My glass lined dwelling is built into the hill on his land--- and due to my medical conditions (documented and verified), I am housebound and live under very different circumstances/ conditions than most people. My dwelling and person are unmovable.
- But, if you would try to avoid me by slightly more distance, given I live away from even the smallest of power lines on three sides of my property, and have underground lines on the property... and also live with minimal voltage, this would be so helpful and I would be grateful.

Residential

- I live as I said, with only minimal voltage, heating the buildings up when not in it and live with no electromagnetic devices and appliances due to health complications from these incidents already.
- To whom it may concern: Our home is located on the SE 1/4 of 28-7-56. This proposed route (map 7, L2) would pass 1/2 mile west of our home site and would pass through over 1/2 mile of farmland. This site is on the half mile line and not on a section line.
- Yoder and Rush are developing communities. We have lots of children in our area, livestock, wells.
- Yes very special uses and circumstances which are medically documented... Ones the 302nd air lift wing at Peterson air Force Base even avoids it in their practice maneuvers due to the conditions. My land is used for the residence of this special medical patient.
- I own the land at NE 1/4 sec 4 T15S R60W south of Rush.
- I ask you to use the alternative route or other suggestions I have provided north of Highway 94 were a transmission line already exists, or whatever is necessary to avoid her by a few more miles. Thank you, Robert Paul.
- My land is 4 miles SW of Rush, Colorado in (NE 1/4 sec 4 T15S R60W) I was part of the construction crew also that designed and built the GLASSLINED special residence for Marcia Schafer-- which took time to construct and find materials for that were suitable, nontoxic, and non conductive electromagnetically. This building is built into the side of the hill and it cannot be moved and her condition is such that she cannot be moved to alternative housing.
- Objections to proposed Route J4 as shown on Sheet Map 9: I own farmland adjacent to the proposed route J4 south of Limon. I had considered some limited residential development on that land, but the presence of a huge power transmission line and towers just to the west will substantially devalue that land.
- Along the proposed Route J4 as it runs from Limon south to a point approximately 13 miles south of Limon, then turns southwesterly, crosses highway 71, and passes off of Sheet Map 9, it directly impacts at least 10 residences in terms of view and electrical interferences. That would not be as true of an alternative such as J1, since the pastureland is more sparsely settled.
- If the above suggestion is not possible, then please reconsider alternative routes J1 or J3/J5. Those routes both cross less farmland and more rangeland than does j4, through sparsely settled areas. Lower acquisition costs, lower damage and loss of production claims.
- Alternative suggestions to proposed route J4: Since Western must acquire easement/right of way for the 230 kV line from Big Sandy substation to 125 mile substation (N1 and N2, or N3, or N4) could that also accommodate the 500kV line that must go to Midway? That line then could proceed from 125 mile south and connect with J3/J5 to reach Midway. Less easement acquisition, less farmland, more rangeland, sparsely settled.
- Please consider any alternative for this line that goes west, rather than south of Limon across pasture rather than farmland, and that impacts fewer residences. You will have to cross Interstate 70 and the Big Sandy Creek either way, so that is not a factor.

Residential

- Part of the beauty of the eastern plains is the wide open, unobstructed views. We built our house to take advantage of those views. Every morning the sun rises in the east and we have a magnificent view of the sun rise. The same is true for full moons that crest pumpkin orange. Power lines to the east of our house would significantly impact those views.
- We live just north of Limon and west of the Limon airport. We can see the Big Sandy substation from our house. Accordingly the routes of interest and impact are the 1. Energy Center to Big Sandy Route, specifically F8, F9, & F10 and 2. Midway to Big Sandy Route, specifically J1, J2, J3, and J4. (See attachment for specific concerns).
- I intend to build at least one residential structure on this land in 2010.
- There is one residence and other farm structures on each of the parcels. The cattle and horses are at 68851 East 88th avenue. The ground is primarily irrigated farm ground with four pivot sprinklers on the 640 acre parcel and two pivot sprinklers on the 320 acre parcel. Traditionally, the crops include corn, grass hay, alfalfa hay, wheat and millet. The dryland corners are planted to wheat or millet in a rotation cycle.
- The population of Colorado is growing, regardless of lack of water or available infrastructure. We recognize you need to provide the electricity it takes to serve those people. But we fail to understand why you have to impact the very things we value to serve others. If your structures are not a public health hazard, why do you need to avoid more direct routes just so you are not placing your towers in areas of higher density housing?
- The proposed routes impact too many homes of the people that live out here. We believe that there other routes that would impact less homes and people of the eastern plains.
- The routes should be either 1/2 mile north of Highway 94 or 1/2 mile south of 94. This would make more sence [sic] and impact less homes. This would also shorten the route some. Enclosed is a map with the area circled.
- Your proposed and alternative routes impact too many homes and people who live in the corridor from Midway to Big Sandy. Your maps are outdated and do not show the homes that are presently in the corridor.
- There is an EASTERN PLAINS transmission project going on and the residents on the eastern plains are having a problem with the proposed routes.
- We are in the corodor [sic] from MIDWAY to BIG SANDY. There are a lot of homes and new homes in the area that will be impacted.
- We custom built our home ourselves for our retirement. This is a lifetime of work and savings for us. My daughter has never lived in any other home but this. We put extra insulation package in home to make it energy efficient. It is ADA ready for our old age- including extra strong safety bars and wide door ways. We planned to sell this home to pay for old age home and if needed daughters college. We have no other retirement.
- Open land can and should be used rather than fast developing rural communities.

Residential

- We are part of the "State of Colorado" state tax payers, both on income and property yet you say you can't go through state land where nothing but cattle graze, no homes are on this land.
- They can go too less impacted areas- at least farther from as many homes as can be.
- Home was a lifetime of finding, locating fixtures, designing, acquiring monies to build by hand ourselves. House was inspected meets all codes. Built custom, very strong framing & insulation factors custom utility options i.e.: lighting house/ barns/ phone and water source. Married in 1969- raised family- now raising granddaughters (doing very well- honor roll/ student council/ scholarship awarded).
- Mrs. Porter phoned because she could not determine how close the proposed route actually was to her property from the map she received. I told her we could send her out an aerial map that would show exactly how close the proposed route actually was. She provided her property coordinates (N 1/2 section 19, sections 17, 18, 7, 8, 9, 1, 2, 12 T3S, R54W) and stated she was concerned that the line would be right next to her house. She also asked that I send her a comment form.
- Small children, horses, dogs, cattle, barn, house.
- My children, family, horses, animals, house, barn, neighbors, and what effects it will have.
- My questions and concerns deal with: 1. location and placement of lines, 2. type of construction of towers, 3. effect on and consideration of operations and tenants.
- Hope you use the planned route (sic) the 2nd choice on route near Hugo as much of this land is very sandy & blows easily. Also near my home.
- The maps that WAPA is using are not up to date and do not show many of the homes in our area. Several more homes are to be set up in our subdivision and other nearby areas.
- We urge you to look for a more suitable route. The area several miles south of us would impact fewer people than this proposed route just south of Sanborn Rd.
- We are retired school teachers each with more than 30 years in the classroom. We wanted to live in a rural setting, so we acquired some land near Yoder in 1998.
- Our pasture was not good for raising cattle so we decided to develop our land for residential use. We began this project with land surveys which were recorded with El Paso County in the year 2000. Since that time our sub-divided land has been developed to provide several young families a place to raise their children in the country. These are hard-working people struggling to make a living and secure their homes. They have invested much into these dream homes.
- We own and live on section 14 1s 63w and maps we have seen show the proposed line coming through this section. We presently have 2 center pivot irrigation sprinklers and have plans to put 2 more up and this would not be possible with the proposed line coming through this section.
- The location of this section is prime for development in the future. With the Co Hwy 79 along one side and Bromley land on the other access is prime.
- What is the setback distance of the line from farm homes, corrals, wells, etc.

Residential

- What is the setback distance of the line from farm homes, corrals, wells, etc.
- I've lived in the Ellicott/Rush community all my life and my family and I chose to move to this specific location specifically because of the beautiful view.
- On the other hand, the other routes will follow a route already there or eventually effect less people, due to the smaller population of the south-east portions of the county.
- For the past four (4) years my family and I have lived on the land I purchased.
- Route G5 would seem to me to be the better route than either G3 or G4. It would impact a lot fewer people and it would be cheaper.
- The idea of following Highway 71 south out of Limon is a corridor that would have less impact on rural development and families.
- Ranches are longtime 'homesteaded' ranches. Less likely to subdivide in the future. Water in and around this corridor is limited. Hard to find. Limiting future growth.
- This also crosses an area you and I discussed that is larger ranches and less concentration of homes. They also are mostly 'homesteaded' ranches. And possibly less likely to sub-divide. Yet it does allow for separate routing of circuits as you indicated you prefer. This is one area I see worth while to investigate. Yet I do not have the mapping that you do. So I will ask you to look into this area and see if it can not be made to work.
- Ms Geis received the mailers that were sent out to landowners, she was wondering where the route was in relation to her property. She also had questions regarding any payment for right of way encroachment. She is in the process of selling her land and may want to add a clause in the land sales contract that she receive any money paid for the potential securing of right of way on her land. T 8S - R 42W - S SE 1/4 30T 8S - R 43W - S E 1/2 25.
- Ms. Jennings phoned because she received a new landowner notification letter in the mail and was very upset that she had not been contacted earlier regarding the transmission line project. Based on the map she received along with the letter, she is certain that the transmission line will be directly above her residence and she has questions on how she will be compensated for any damages or loss of property that may occur.
- Mrs. Buck was concerned for her daughter when she received the scoping packet. She asked if we were using this power for Colorado and if the lines would be using "towers" (power for the region and line in question is 500kV so at this point lattice towers. She asked if we would be looking for ROW and easements and if we'd pay for them (yes, if the route encroaches on the land in question and we would pay market value for ROW and easement based on a professional appraisal, we would not "buy" the land just pay for the ROW. The line segment in question is 1.38 miles from her property. Spoke to Sally Buck (mother) 106 N. Boone Ave. Boone, CO - 81025 T 21S - R 61W - very small lot in Sec. 6 - Rudy Apodaca.
- Whatever right of way that you end up with should be only for the transmission line and in no way should you have the right to sub-lease or sell any part of that right-of-way to anyone else. Only the landowners should have that right.

Residential

- I am opposed to any transmission lines across my property of any magnitude. I am opposed to eminent domain. I am opposed to any unwanted easement by "anybody" including Eastern Plains Transmission Project/ Western Area Power Ad./ Department of Energy/ USA for both my properties in Elbert/Boone, Colorado.

Rights-of-Way Acquisition

- Some of your glossary of terms are not stated very friendly. For example; Easement - says you have certain rights, well what rights? And the worst are the words "judgment in condemnation". These are fighting words that you will have to overcome. An example would be to state an easement is xx number of feet wide for a 500 kV line and can only be used for the purpose of the electric transmission line and its maintenance. No other entity can use this easement for another purpose unless they pay the landowner the proper value for an easement.
- How much land will it take, Road?
- The proposed alignment of the 500kV line 6 miles North of Arriba appears to be acceptable if the affected landowners are fairly compensated.
- Also concerned about compensation- relative to the inconvenience of farming around structures & lags of crop where structures are located.
- Do not appreciate attitude of real estate representative. Backing of condemnation, et. Not a good tactic to use with people. Best to say interested in coming to an agreement, but work with landowners.
- Will provide right-of-entry if written notice is provided \$200 was explained for ROE.
- We have several problems with their proposed plan which is to obtain a two hundred foot wide easement and to construct a thirty foot permanent access road.
- From what we have been told that you are only interested in purchasing a right of way, not compensating for the loss of value to the rest of the parcels (which incidentally have 35 acre minimums set in this area).
- Three years ago a large electric line went across several of my fields. Compensation to go over the above mentioned cropland would need to be much higher as compared to what I received for the electric line 3 years ago.
- This way you could avoid the deep sands area and perhaps have to buy fewer rights of way?
- What compensation is proposed for the obliteration of all future development potential of lands taken by eminent domain for this project?
- Existing undeveloped road easement.
- My property seems to be in the alternative route (33510 Big Springs Rd, Yoder, CO) how much land of ours do you need? Will we be reimbursed?

Rights-of-Way Acquisition

- I would be appreciative if you could be more specific as to the proposed legal description, and perhaps inform me of the relationships of your possible taking with the BAAB property.
- Asked how we would compensate for ROW.
- After speaking with the land person at the meeting it concerns me only 90% of the assessed property value - not only are you purchasing property at below value we will also see an increase in our electric bill to pay for the project.
- However if the 200' easement would prevent this future tree planting, then I would like to see the line shifted slightly west or use the J3 alternate route instead of the J4 route.
- Would like a detail of the existing transmission line easement AND its likely relationship with the easement of the 500 kV line.
- I (K. Kampbell) answered a few of his questions but advised him that there would be realty specialists at the public meetings and he stated he would try and attend the one at Lamar.
- Mr. Shaw phoned because he has received an aerial which showed both the proposed and alternative routes going along his property. He had questions regarding the process by which Western would obtain an easement on his property and the process of condemnation.
- She asked if we'd buy the land and how much would be paid (no, we only 'buy' the ROW of 200 ft. wide the price is based on appraised value and market price. Her mother's name is Lois Shafer.
- During the phone conversation 2/15/07 Mr. Schmisser asked when/how we'd contact for Rights of Entry (via letter., early March 2007). Said he'd be agreeable, provided his wishes and limitations are met.
- She asked how the land value was determined (third party appraisal, market value, only purchase ROW, not land); how wide the ROW would be (200 ft.), what kind of towers would be used (steel lattice).
- Also, they wondered how the land was acquired, I explained the ROW process, appraisal, market value ROW width, we don't buy the land, etc (Sec. W1/2 T12S R61W).
- The letter I received a 3 mile easement, however should be 1 mile wide.
- You want to pay us once, yet we will have to work around the poles forever. We need to be paid for the right of way and a payment every year that they are in the way.
- Should the decision be made to request authorization to construct such line, my client will substantially object to the same and pursue all courses of action necessary to oppose the proposed transmission line crossing Owl Canyon Property.
- This situation creates a complete, and in our opinion, unconstitutional, taking of the property.

Rights-of-Way Acquisition

- Alternative suggestions to proposed Route J4: If the above suggestion is not possible, then please reconsider alternative routes J1 or J3/J5. Those routes both cross less farmland and more rangeland that does J4, through sparsely settled areas. Lower acquisition costs, lower damage and loss of production claims.
- Objections to proposed Route J4 as shown on Sheet Map 9: As J4 crosses Townships 10S and 11S, R56W, it passes through or borders some 16 sections, nearly all of which is ACTIVE FARMLAND. It seems that selection of a route such as J1 that uses primarily range/pasture land would result in lower costs for acquisition of easements/rights of way (land values are lower) and less loss of agricultural productivity, since livestock grazing is more compatible with transmission lines than is farming.
- Alternative suggestions to proposed Route J4: Since Western must acquire easement/right of way for the 230kV line from Big Sandy substation to 125 mile substation (N1, N2, N3, or N4), could that also accommodate the 500 kV line that must go to Midway? That line then could proceed from 125 mile south and connect with J3/J5 to reach midway. Less easement acquisition, less farmland, more rangeland, sparsely settled.
- It looks like your plan is to go right through the middle of us. I am a lawyer and the District Judge in Pratt, Kansas. I fully understand your rights of eminent domain. I also understand the route can change. It is obviously way to early to start negotiating right of way and damage issues.
- Bob Wilger – grazing land use converted to dry crops in T21SR43W, Section 2; alternative drawn on Sheet 36; requested that single steel poles be used; requested annual payments for easements.
- Clifford Johnston – T19SR54W, Section 26; prefers location as proposed but either would be okay; Ruthette talked to about acquisition of easement.
- Can the payment for the easement be stung out. Does it have to be paid all at once—can you pay it over 5 years with interest?
- Mr. Mitchek called about the letter he received (ROE) and states the route in question is too close to his house, if we moved it a bit he'd feel better about the situation. Sec. 25 SE 1/4 35, T15S, R43W, Sec. 1, W 1/2 12 T46S, R43W.
- In addition to that, he would hope that we will off-set an additional 60ft to accommodate his farm equipment in order for him to get around the towers.
- There currently are no roads along the north edge of Section 32, but he is assuming we will off-set the 200 ft easement to allow for future County Roads should they be built.
- We cannot keep the weeds from growing around the poles and brace structure and the Tri State makes no attempt to spray, pull or eradicated the weeds as their right of way contract with me required.
- I went from being the proposed route to an alternative route at this last session. I sincerely hope that does not change. I had many concerns regarding health issues, property resale values, and right of way accesses that I expressed last fall.

Rights-of-Way Acquisition

- Your agreement sets forth a two year period for right of access in the amount of \$200.00. I reject this amount. This amount seems unreasonable for the time period and the potential risk. There is a strong emotionally tie to this property in that our family homesteaded this property (we have the original patent signed by President Taft.) However, I will agree to \$1500 for the same terms.
- Letter dated 2-26-2007 with agreement for right of entry appears the proposed towers are on (sic), Nickerson.
- Before attending the meeting in Lakin, Feb 19th I received a map with proposed route on the county line- Hamilton/Greeley...at the meeting we were showed a map and it had changed to go across 10-20-40, we suggested to not take a 100 ft on each landowner.
- I absolutely DO NOT want this transmission line to go across our land which by your map would be the N1/2 Sec. 12, 1S-44W, & SE1/4 Sec. 13, 1S-45W in Yuma County. I don't think it's right that you can just decide to put something like this across our land and destroy it without even asking the landowner. I would never give my consent for an easement across this land.
- Co-locating energy transmission projects allows shared use of easements, especially temporary construction easements, and consolidates the adverse impacts of the facilities into a single corridor rather than spreading them all over.
- The 1 mile corridor is quite a vague concept for someone that only owns 35 acres. As you can imagine the one mile corridor may mean a mile away from my home which would be good or right through my property not so good.
- Asked about how the centerline would be developed (within one mile corridor, try to place along roads, property lines, section lines, existing ROW, irrigation considerations, existing physical/geological considerations etc), and how payments for ROW are processed (third party appraisal, only purchase ROW not land, one time payment, 90 percent of market value, they still own the land.).
- A 200 foot permanent easement is required. Is there a plan to request a temporary construction easement during construction?
- Who will have ownership rights to the transmission line?
- What kind of easement action will be required/ proposed? There are concerns of field damage based on easement access locations.
- That's why I endorse the option of the alternative line J5 and not proposed line J4 & also my proposal of the usage of the existing 345kV transmission line north of Highway 94 even if have to extend the right of way wider.
- However I would like to see transmission lines put where they are needed and kept confined as much as possible to existing right of ways, not scattered everywhere.
- What is wrong with using county rights of way? I was originally told that the line would be following 1-70. What has happened to this proposal?

Rights-of-Way Acquisition

- Midway substation to Big Sandy Substation proposed route J4: this route (J4) is mostly over active farmland. J1 or J3 are mostly over range (pasture) land. Farmland is valued at about 4 times that of pasture land. Farmland is more densely settled. Your acquisition costs will be much higher and your damage settlements for loss of productivity will be much higher on farm land than on range land.
- If the above suggestion is not possible, then please reconsider alternative routes J1 or J3/J5. Those routes both cross less farmland and more rangeland than does J4, through sparsely settled areas. Lower acquisition costs, lower damage and loss of production claims.
- Alternative suggestions to proposed route J4: Since Western must acquire easement/right of way for the 230 kV line from Big Sandy substation to 125 mile substation (N1 and N2, or N3, or N4) could that also accommodate the 500kV line that must go to Midway? That line then could proceed from 125 mile south and connect with J3/J5 to reach Midway. Less easement acquisition, less farmland, more rangeland, sparsely settled.
- As J4 crosses Townships 10S and 11S, R56W it passes through or borders some 16 sections, nearly all of which is ACTIVE FARMLAND. It seems that selection of a route such as J1 that uses primarily range, pasture land would result in lower costs for acquisition of easements/ rights of way (land values are lower) and less loss of agricultural productivity, since livestock grazing is more compatible with transmission lines than is farming.
- A 100- 140 tower can not be contained if it falls in a 200' easement if its base is 50, that leaves 75 feet to each side to fall. And cables can fall also.
- We would also, if the new lines go across our property, that the compensation for the use of our property be fair and right for all concerned.
- Do you have a contract to put out for the land owner to look at?
- The area map indicates the proposed route of the Midway to Big Sandy located across the middle of sections 31 & 32 in El Paso County. We do not believe this would be beneficial to our property in any way, and most likely would deteriorate its development potential. By running your power lines directly through the center of our property, I believe you will cut the possible selling price by 75%. With the current growth in this area, this land has serious development potential. Therefore, we would expect financial compensation for the entire 1280 acres if this would happen.
- If this project goes through according to the map we viewed our property is not only devalued, it is devastated. This would not be a hypothetical scenario. The easement road would cross our home and barn. It would render both our properties worthless.
- Second, why would the power line reroute from Sanborn Road, where there is easy access to poles, so dramatically and negatively impact property owners?

Rights-of-Way Acquisition

- We realize that there is a lot of open land and manufactured housing along the proposed route. This area however, has several new farms with stick built homes. Our home is NOT low income housing. We have a custom home which was recently appraised at well over \$300,000. That is just for one of the parcels. Together with the adjoining lot the figure is close to \$400,000. We bought this farm upon retiring from the Air Force and have spent the past several years building a new life for our nine children. This may be a business decision for your company. It is our life.

Social or Economic Values

- Property Value? Property Sale? Its on the market for sale. Location of my building.
- Reduced value of land near locations of power lines.
- Finally, on a personal note, my husband is currently serving our country in Afghanistan. I am sorrowful to have to tell him that while he is away risking his life for our freedom, a company is proposing to greatly depreciate and/or ruin all that he has dreamt of and worked and saved for a long time to obtain.
- Next, an "alternative route" was indicated on the maps we received from you. I respectfully request that you utilize the "alternative route" instead of the proposed route which will cut right through our property and run over or near our residence. The proposed high-voltage transmission line will directly depreciate our property value.
- Furthermore, I noticed that none of the scheduled meeting locations are in an area near our residence. I will have to take off from work to drive to another town to be able to attend. Is there compensation for lost wages and inconvenience for not having a meeting in our town?
- I know you understand that the majority of the people you will encounter at these open house meetings will not have the knowledge to fully understand the overall benefits of this project. They really only care to know how it will affect them personally. People generally do not like change and in Elbert and El Paso Counties they don't like condemnation.
- We need powerlines!
- Considering developing agro-tourism on property. Power lines would detract- visual quality.
- Great chance of rural development, renewable energy development, increased chance of new jobs being created, and better public relations from all of the above.
- Surface damages to property should go to lessee not to land owner since lessee must (sic) the damages.
- Please don't raise our rates too much for this project.
- I change \$1M for my property- 200 feet.
- Would it save money on freight for coal and elec. Loss by putting the plant in WY.
- Do not pay lessee's state only.

Social or Economic Values

- Also concerned about compensation- relative to the inconvenience of farming around structures & lags of crop where structures are located.
- Pay for chemicals and labor costs.
- What monetary compensation will be offered for loss of aesthetic value and possible loss of revenue generated by ag tourism?
- Property values close to or where the transmission line crosses may also decrease.
- What are the decisions and cost comparisons for single pole vs. steel lattice- how is that decision made? Who makes it?
- Real Estate.
- I hope to sell in the next five years and need optimum factors for the sale.
- Mainly concerned with decrease in property values IE views.
- I also was very concerned about the depreciation of my property values.
- Would prefer J10, but if J7 is chosen, would almost rather have it over her house (and buy her out) rather than re-aligned but close-by.
- People in Colorado with views of Pikes Peak have added value to their property simply because of the view. In Western Kansas, our valuable view is our sunsets. Putting these structures within one-two miles west of the residences destroys some of the value of the residence. Who wants to look at ugly metal towers silhouetted against a Kansas sunset?
- I would like to see alternative B-11 happen, since Tribune, Kansas is a small town that needs help economically. This community is hurting, and any boost to the tax base would help tremendously.
- That alternative route on both sides of Hwy 36 just east of Byers affects many other existing homes or land in the process of being developed for home sites or planned to be in the near future & will definitely cause problems and dispute.
- Centennial Ranch, Indian artifacts and campsites, fragile land, land has significant future value compared to suggested re-route.
- If lines do not affect health and are primarily an aesthetic issue, then why don't you move the corridor away from land on which the line would have an economic impact (development, agriculture).
- It will destroy our view, ruin our property values, and create a serious health risk. This is not fair or reasonable.
- I enjoy my quiet. Power lines humm [sic], devalue property, and will mess up the beautiful sunrise.
- How will this project effect property values.

Social or Economic Values

- I am asking to see the evaluation made as to environmental justice, land use- residential, economic values and visual resources as to the effect on my home site that are planned for the N 1/2, S-31, T-1N, R-63W.
- Decreased property values.
- Will I still own the land as the 40 acres or am I going to have to take the loss and have less land that what I am paying for?
- I will not be able to sell the property for the real value and the mortgage company still wants me to make payment on the full loan of the 40 acres which I will not have.
- This power line is going through my property and this will cause a major devalue of this property since I will loose [sic] the use of much of my land.
- For example: If the power company uses 10 of my acres and pay \$500.00 per acre that is only a one time payment of \$5000.00.
- We understand there are utility needs in this region. We just don't feel it is reasonable, nor ethical, to ask one family to absorb nearly \$400,000 to help provide for those utilities however.
- We have been told, however, that our land is already devalued to such an extent because of the pending utility project that we would be unlikely to recover our mortgage if we could even find anyone willing to buy under these circumstances.
- Then there is the question of devaluation. Studies have shown that the presence of high voltage power lines and the popular opinion of their danger.
- Despite the sacrifices, we loved serving our country but we looked forward to putting down roots and finally giving our children the rural lifestyle we had dreamed of for two decades. We were overjoyed when we found a spacious, handicapped accessible home in which to begin our new life.
- I am the father of nine wonderful children, the oldest of whom has Spina Bifida which left him with multiple handicaps. For twenty years my wife and children traveled from one military installation to another while I was an officer in the USAF. By the time I retired in 2005 we had lived in thirteen homes and I had deployed to Guantanamo Bay, Saudi Arabia, and most recently Iraq (during which I missed the birth of our eighth child.).
- It has been a good life out here. This life we have built is in jeopardy because of the route of the powerline project coupled with the siting of the buildings on our property.
- This will put us in a terrible dilemma of not being able to stay and not being able to go.
- From what we have been told that you are only interested in purchasing a right of way, not compensating for the loss of value to the rest of the parcels (which incidentally have 35 acre minimums set in this area).
- We understand there are utility needs in this region. We just don't feel it is reasonable, nor ethical, to ask one family to absorb nearly \$400,000 to help provide for those utilities however.

Social or Economic Values

- As a military veteran I can only afford one mortgage. If the savings we have invested into our home are lost to us we have nothing.
- It would be such bitter irony to have given twenty years in the service of our government only to have another branch of the government cost us our entire retirement pay in lost mortgage.
- Three years ago a large electric line went across several of my fields. Compensation to go over the above mentioned cropland would need to be much higher as compared to what I received for the electric line 3 years ago.
- With this in mind, my wife and I are planning to build our "dream" home at this site. Any consideration on your behalf pertaining to tower sites should/must be taken into consideration. Our property address is: 3885 Mulberry Rd. Yoder, CO 80864.
- We purchased the below listed property April 13th, 2006. At that time, no word was mentioned about this proposal. Since then we have had Mountain View Electric bring power to the proposed homesite.
- As an owner of a residential building site in Evergreen Country Estates located in Section 36, T3S, R61W that the "L12" section of the line, even though it does not lie directly on my property, will be a great detriment to my building site investment for which I will be seeking full damage compensation and alternative routes.
- Also, the CRP contract means expensive grasses and restoration costs if CRP remains on some or all of this land.
- We are studying uses for our land over the next few years and this power line will greatly reduce the value of our land and make it almost impossible for development, farming and ranching, irrigation, conservation easement.
- Another transmission line on our property is going to limit what we can do and greatly reduce the value and the potential money we can receive for developing this land for maximum profit.
- I'm pro-progress but can't afford to lose land use or mineral remuneration without objecting strenuously.
- As an owner of a residential building site in Evergreen Country Estates located in Section 36. T3S R61W the "L12" section of the line, your proposed high voltage power line will be a great detriment to my building site investment for which I will be seeking full damage compensation.
- What compensation is proposed for the obliteration of all future development potential of lands taken by eminent domain for this project?
- Some of our land is still for sale, and we hope to sell in the near future. We are concerned as to whether we will be able to sell if the powerline crosses our property.
- Mr. Bradshaw asked if wind generation would be allowed to tie into this system, my reply was that the interconnect issues are dealt with by Tri-State, he asked if having a wind farm close to transmission lines was better or worse (better as far as construction costs).
- Would the presence of the lines make the property undesirable for residential development?

Social or Economic Values

- If the power lines go through the property I own, will their presence devalue the property for uses other than grazing and farming?
- I would prefer to not have powerlines around L12 and L14 because of the high possibility of development on our land.
- Damages to the business need to definitely be discussed.
- What research or statistics are there to evaluate the decline of property value due to the transmission towers.
- After speaking with the land person at the meeting it concerns me only 90% of the assessed property value - not only are you purchasing property at below value we will also see an increase in our electric bill to pay for the project.
- I made this suggestion at the meeting in Lakin and was told to put the idea on this form and send it in. To reduce cost and various landowner ill-will it would seem logical to use the one route going North our of Holcomb to the Burlington substation for both Lamar and Burlington.
- Expect crop damage from construction to last for multiple crop cycles due compaction of construction equipment and be prepared to reimburse farm operators for lost production through those cycles.
- Mr. Pritchett phoned because he was concerned about the possibility of the transmission line going through his property and lessening the value on it.
- Concerns: 1. The environmental impact on my property 2. The decrease in value 3. The on-going disruption and adverse effects on human, plant, and animal life.
- We feel that this will effect [sic] us and our lifestyle more than anything can except a highway.
- We have developed sections 12 & 13 for residential use "35 acres" this project will destroy our land values for selling these lots.
- We feel that this will effect [sic] us and our lifestyle more than anything can except a highway.
- Property values.
- Investment/ future home site.
- Lowering the value of my property.
- Also in this era of terrorism we should increase and vary routes wherever and whenever possible.
- I will retire within the next 2 years and I am concerned that it will interfere with my property and my view, as well as the value of the land.
- You want to pay us once, yet we will have to work around the poles forever. We need to be paid for the right of way and a payment every year that they are in the way.
- This additional line will further hurt the value of this property.
- These lines are of no benefit to us or this area. We do not want them on our property.

Social or Economic Values

- These lines that are going to Colorado have no benefit to us.
- Further, upon investigation and consultation with a real estate expert and appraiser knowledgeable about real estate in Pueblo County, Colorado it is our position that health risk associated with the combined 1200 kilovolts of power as well as the noise and visible pollution created by the same would substantially damage the value if not make the Owl Canyon Property unmarketable.
- This situation creates a complete, and in our opinion, unconstitutional, taking of the property.
- In addition and equally important, while the scientific studies relative to health impacts resulting from proximity to high voltage transmission lines may not be conclusive one way or another, there is certainly a public perception that it is undesirable to have a home and to reside in close proximity to electrical transmission facilities and there is a mark of stigma which diminishes the value of homes in proximity to such facilities.
- The impacted residences and business will decline in value, as there will be adverse impacts on the use from these homes.
- In addition, locating the transmission lines on active farmland will adversely impact the ability to conduct agricultural aviation activities necessary on that property as it will create a greater danger in the conduct of those activities and will result in an increased cost to the farmers contracting for agricultural aviation work (assuming that the individuals involved in that industry will provide those services to areas crossed by or under transmission lines.).
- This property has a higher value than the range and pasture land property which is predominant on the alternate routes.
- We also believe the presence of the J4 transmission line will decrease the value of our property due to the close proximity to our home. If we chose to sell the property, potential purchasers could use the close proximity as leverage to devalue the property.
- My concerns are as follows: The presence of these towers and lines will decrease the value of my farm ground.
- My concerns are as follows: The 500kV towers will make it more costly and less effective to farm the ground.
- I don't like it going through our farmland as it will be a nuisance farming around and will devalue the property.
- My two greatest concerns are: Devaluation and salability of my property.
- Our son and his family live in the area in question and our first concern would be possible adverse health effects and loss of property.
- This effects [sic] our family, friends, and neighbors who live in these areas. We are concerned about adverse health issues, property values.
- Will it decrease the value of our land.

Social or Economic Values

- Objections to proposed Route J4 as shown on Sheet Map 9: As J4 crosses Townships 10S and 11S, R56W, it passes through or borders some 16 sections, nearly all of which is ACTIVE FARMLAND. It seems that selection of a route such as J1 that uses primarily range/pasture land would result in lower costs for acquisition of easements/rights of way (land values are lower) and less loss of agricultural productivity, since livestock grazing is more compatible with transmission lines than is farming.
- Objections to proposed Route J4 as shown on Sheet Map 9: J4 is now proposed for some 3 miles to pass along the borders of land owned and farmed by one family, Larry and Grace Skinner and Opal Skinner, and to pass within a quarter mile of the skinner residence located on Lincoln County Road 2W. That is a serious impact in terms of home and land value reduction, and cost and inconvenience of farming operations.
- Property damage caused by Transmission line failure, such as [damaged].
- If forced to sell property our being able to purchase another property. Current property mortgage to maximum appraisal. Our credit score poor enough we wouldn't qualify for another home loan.
- Property values.
- Why does it have to be the biggest line that money can buy?
- The line will bring down this piece of land.
- Basing the value of the easement on property values which have already been lowered because the project has been proposed is not fair.
- Mike Coan – prefers M4; not M3; concern with property value in Section 31 east of M3.
- Does not agree with project – it isn't needed – he has enough power; build generation on front range and leave him alone; concern about farming around structures for the rest of his life; no amount of money can pay for that; wife discussed option of putting line on north side of existing line between Big Sandy and Burlington because of CRP land and absentee owners (noted on map) -- husband doesn't like that either because he would still have to look at it and doesn't think project is needed. Lee and Carey talked to extensively.
- Questions about wind generation interconnections; too expensive on 500kV line (referred her to Lee).
- Stewart Stabel – concern with views of segment B4 from house; built million dollar home; segment A6 okay.
- The economic impact is less on grazing than on farmland.
- You will drastically interfere with the aerial applicators—this will cause a permanent increase in cost and lost productivity in the farmland.
- Property values will decrease.
- Can the payment for the easement be stung out. Does it have to be paid all at once—can you pay it over 5 years with interest?

Social or Economic Values

- She will never be able to sell any of her 7000 acres because this line would be there
- I recently purchased this land at the same auction Tri-State purchased the two sections where the proposed 125 mile substation will be located. I had no idea at the time there would be either a substation or a new 230 kV line going across my new land.
- They tell me Wind and Solar are too expensive to build- that would not cost any more that buying coal and paying the railroads for the next 50 years to haul it to Garden City. Also the 1000 miles of line required from Garden City to the Front Range is not "cheap".
- Will it decrease the value of our land
- I went from being the proposed route to an alternative route at this last session. I sincerely hope that does not change. I had many concerns regarding health issues, property resale values, and right of way accesses that I expressed last fall.
- I own land in the proposed toll road (falcon prairie Toll Road) corridor and much media attention has now surfaced that the titles to our properties have been flagged to eliminate the sale of those properties. When a title search is ordered and this is revealed the lender will no longer contract on that property. I asked your real estate people at the Hanover meeting if this would happen with your project. No one knew the answer to that only that I would have to disclose the information to the prospective buyer.
- If the alternative route is used, he wants full compensation for his property.
- Your agreement sets forth a two year period for right of access in the amount of \$200.00. I reject this amount. This amount seems unreasonable for the time period and the potential risk. There is a strong emotionally tie to this property in that our family homesteaded this property (we have the original patent signed by President Taft.) However, I will agree to \$1500 for the same terms.
- Market value today, what is it? And what will it be in 25 years?
- As an administrator of the school district impacted by the current projected path of the project, I am concerned that I will lose both staff and students who will move to avoid the power lines. We are the 16th smallest district in Colorado and very isolated. Students and quality staff are vital to the district. I believe the route should be re routed to a less populated area.
- We service 145 students and have a staff of 36. This is a fragile district with only 22 students in grades K-12 in 1992. I fear that any route south of COLO 94 will have a very negative impact on the district- perhaps even threatening it's future existence.
- Frost Livestock has labored vigorously for decades to maintain a large expanse of land intact with minimal fragmentation. The criteria used to evaluate alternatives should place the highest value on large areas of contiguous productive agricultural lands under common ownership because these lands are increasingly rare and valuable due to rampant development on surrounding properties.
- In combination with other looming threats and encroachments, the Transmission Project will ultimately play a role in devaluing the land such that the ranch's only financially viable alternative may be to sell of property for other land uses.

Social or Economic Values

- In the 21st century, it is increasingly difficult for small family farms such as the Frost Livestock Co. to earn a reasonable return from agricultural operations.
- The contrasting views of mountains to the west and sweeping, open prairie to the east capture the allure of Colorado's varied landscapes and represent an important economic draw for the region. Protection of the views to and from the Frost Livestock Ranch benefits the public as well as the owners of the ranch.
- Financial compensation provided to landowners whose property is burdened with power lines is insufficient to mitigate the long-term deleterious [sic] effects to family-owned agricultural lands and the natural resources they support.
- Frost Livestock operations help sustain the local agricultural economy.
- Section 27 is the location of the proposed EPTP alternate power line route and switching station site (identified as M4). For the following reasons, you should choose M3 as the preferred route: 4. Land with power line structure simply does not have the same value as land that does not. As time goes on and families simply cannot afford to continue farming, they have the right to sell the land for development. The existence of a sunstation and perpendicular powerlines running through the property will substantially reduce the potential value of the land.
- You will be negatively impacting our property values.
- These areas that you proposed to put the transmission power lines are my livelihood for both my hunting preserve and my hay and cattle business. The hay that is planted in the circles irrigation provides financial income for my family and feed for my own cattle and the stubble that is left after cutting is for my hunting preserve.
- The proposed power lines would affect my irrigation, water rights, hunting preserve business and hay business. It would cost me money to move the center pivots that I have had at these locations for 5 years on my land.
- No matter what payment is received for "damages" the value of the land will forever be reduced.
- There will be a decline in value of our residence and our farm ground.
- All farming operations such as spraying, tilling, and planting around the towers would be more costly and can not be as efficiently done.
- The line will impact the property value of not only the owner of the land beneath the line but also adjacent owners whose land values diminish because of diminished views, obviously this is subjective and EPTP can't reimburse everyone.
- The line will impact the property value of not only the owner of the land beneath the line but also adjacent owners whose land values diminish because of diminished views, obviously this is subjective and EPTP can't reimburse everyone.
- Care and compensation should be administered by being a good neighbor, helping out in the community (communities). In the long run EPTP will profit. Many of the rural communities that continue to suffer hopefully can, also benefit.

Social or Economic Values

- We all understand the importance of growth but we as a community are concerned with our investments, property devaluation, health.
- More importantly, our concern is the loss of our "country atmosphere". We believe the substation and poles create a huge visual distraction.
- Yoder and Rush are developing communities. We have lots of children in our area, livestock, wells.
- Obviously the great amount of time and money we have invested here were not done with the thought that a power line would come through.
- These line would devastate not only our property values but also the quality of life for which we live here in the first place.
- To say we are against this project crossing our land cannot be stressed enough. We scrimped and saved for 17 years to be able to buy land of our own.
- If the alternative route (which would run diagonal to the existing power line) would be used, it could negatively affect the property's marketability.
- Regarding sections 23 & 24 of T15S, R63W of the 6th PM in El Paso County, Colorado. The proposed route for the transmission project is acceptable. However, the alternative route could be detrimental to the sale or development of this property. Both of these sections of land are currently on the market and all facts of the transmission project are being disclosed to potential buyers.
- Objections to proposed Route J4 as shown on Sheet Map 9: I own farmland adjacent to the proposed route J4 south of Limon. I had considered some limited residential development on that land, but the presence of a huge power transmission line and towers just to the west will substantially devalue that land.
- Midway substation to Big Sandy Substation proposed route J4: this route (J4) is mostly over active farmland. J1 or J3 are mostly over range (pasture) land. Farmland is valued at about 4 times that of pasture land. Farmland is more densely settled. Your acquisition costs will be must higher and your damage settlements for loss of productivity will be much higher on farm land than on range land.
- If the above suggestion is not possible, then please reconsider alternative routes J1 or J3/J5. Those routes both cross less farmland and more rangeland than does j4, through sparsely settled areas. Lower acquisition costs, lower damage and loss of production claims.
- The presence of a 500kV line along proposed route J4 will de-value my land holding in Lincoln County south of Limon.
- I am concerned about the potential health risks of proximity to high voltage, and possible aesthetic damage, both of which could negatively impact the use, enjoyment, and value of my land.

Social or Economic Values

- As a general statement, it is disconcerting to be constantly reminded that our choice about our way of life is so easily overridden when "the public" needs to be served.
- We have always considered the quiet atmosphere and unobstructed view of our fields and the mountains to be a welcome tradeoff for distances we have to travel for services.
- The population of Colorado is growing, regardless of lack of water or available infrastructure. We recognize you need to provide the electricity it takes to serve those people. But we fail to understand why you have to impact the very things we value to serve others. If your structures are not a public health hazard, why do you need to avoid more direct routes just so you are not placing your towers in areas of higher density housing?
- In general, an irrigated crop or land that is served by a sprinkler raises a higher value crop than dryland farmground. It appears that your alternate route L16 might impact irrigated ground less than dryland ground.
- If they go over us the peoples homes will be devalued about 50% and will result in some people walking away from them and increase the foreclosure rate.
- If they go over us the peoples homes will be devalued about 50% and will result in some people walking away from them and increase the foreclosure rate.
- The lines will devalue home therefore devalue our old age. Situation and chance for a quality of life we've worked for together since 1969.
- We custom built our home ourselves for our retirement. This is a lifetime of work and savings for us. My daughter has never lived in any other home but this. We put extra insulation package in home to make it energy efficient. It is ADA ready for our old age- including extra strong safety bars and wide door ways. We planned to sell this home to pay for old age home and if needed daughters college. We have no other retirement.
- We are part of the "State of Colorado" state tax payers, both on income and property yet you say you can't go through state land where nothing but cattle graze, no homes are on this land.
- We know power is needed to keep the US going and strong, however you need to find a way to impact less Americans to fit the needs of all of us.
- Devaluation of property with increase in insurance rates.
- No doubt power is essential to life's conveniences but the concerns are not to be devalued, I am worried about the effect it will have on my family, property devaluation for if I worry about my families health, why would someone put there family in harms way.
- Our home will be within the one mile corridor, I'm concerned about our community investments, future investing, property devaluation health of my family and myself and our livestock.
- We realize the world population is growing- Electricity is important, but part of what is also important is Americans. Lifestyles city & country- Rural developments, Children less impacted by city congestion- (sic) condensed access/availability to drugs etc.

Social or Economic Values

- Others should not have right to alter our pre-existing properties. Do not put our families & properties at risk on "uncertain risks" How would you feel?
- This is our retirement fund- we worked very hard towards this goal for all of our marriage. If it devalues (which it will) we lose (sic).
- Cost of powerlines vs. cost of American rights & safety issues.
- These lines and towers are massive- they can't help but devalue real estate. That is our retirement home.
- Human lives are worth the extra costs. At any cost- to find alternatives and use them!
- Do you promise that it will not hurt my land. Or the property value.
- I would also like to address the continual problem of adopting changes in cultural practices especially fieldwork and spraying are a continual expense for the owner operators or tenant and really need to be considered as an ongoing expense long after the power line is completed. The operator will have to deal with the additional time and expense for perpetually.
- The lines would devalue the property would make it hard to farm and to be able to get all of the weeds cleared out so bugs would probably take over and damage crops.
- We are extremely concerned about the health and financial well being of these neighbors as well as our own, since the proposed power line would pass very near all of us.
- Our pasture was not good for raising cattle so we decided to develop our land for residential use. We began this project with land surveys which were recorded with El Paso County in the year 2000. Since that time our sub-divided land has been developed to provide several young families a place to raise their children in the country. These are hard-working people struggling to make a living and secure their homes. They have invested much into these dream homes.
- There is no doubt that this power line would have detrimental impacts on our health, the value of our land, and diminished re-sale values, not to mention the negative visual effects and electric interference with radio, television, etc.
- What about if this removes the landowner from the government programs and calls for a pay back like CRP?
- Do you pay damage for the surveyors?
- This is the way I plan to make my living after I retire from a community serving business I have been running for decades. Without the promise of at least a small profit gain from the selling of my parcels, I doubt my property value will remain at all.
- I'm positive that the exact same attributes (view) will be appealing to others when I finally subdivide my property and sell it for my retirement money.
- We very much enjoy the wonderful view of the Rocky Mountains from our front porch. I can honestly say obstructing the view with power lines, that could easily be placed elsewhere and be just as useful, would greatly damage my property value.

Social or Economic Values

- Nearly ten (10) years ago I purchased cattle ranching land at a premium price with hopes of someday developing the land into 35 to 5 acre tracts.
- In my opinion the route should follow the "proposed" route. This way no further destruction of property value is involved. My main concerns rest on the value of my property.
- It may take more poles and be more costly in the "short-term" but farmers look at the future. Towers are not cost-effective over time.
- Route G5 would seem to me to be the better route than either G3 or G4. It would impact a lot fewer people and it would be cheaper.
- And I know also that cost is a factor. But, putting cost of electricity against cost of rights and lifestyles is not an issue I like to hear. Millions of dollars each and every year are wasted on projects and "pork" entitlement. No offense meant to you. But, we are talking people's whole lives here. American taxpayers that support financially these electric companies and the government. If going around an area is more expensive....It's then a choice of how much are the people and their futures in the pathway worth vs how much would cost or hurt to reroute some more distance and/or spend more monies to accomplish this project with our disrupting lifetimes of this rural lifestyle.
- I we can not avoid everyone, Then lets try our very best to avoid as many as possible at any cost. Our concerns are as real as everyone else's. No one has given or will give us (so to speak, a guarantee. Much less a written one.) That this won't devalue our properties and/or damage our health. Would anyone in today's time. Be willing to buy anything on the sat so of the sales person who's job is to sell you that product or idea, with our something in writing as to the promises he makes on that idea or product? I believe not.
- Like I said when we spoke. This is not. And is not going to be between you and I. Just as I do not blame the cashier for the price of gas going up. This is between us and the company. And we are going to fight it with all we have available to us. Some how I believe if it were you and your family. You would do the same.
- I do recognize the need and necessity for electrical power access to be increased. I do also however, recognize the necessity for Americans of all walks of life to be allowed to be free of choice in their lives and lifestyles. I do not want to take away any of the rights of others. I know this must go in somewhere.
- Whenever such construction projects cross the fragile sandhills, south of Brush, there is danger of damage to surrounding land from erosion of the construction area. The gas line of two years ago is a good example.
- Highly erodible soil southeast portion of this section.
- Southeast corner is highly erodible soil.
- Consider relocate of B18 to go through soil bank vs. over farmland at T10S, R41W, Sec 13, NW 1/4.
- Concerned about fragile sandhills pasture.

Social or Economic Values

- Fragile and sandy soil- section 20 T4S R58W.
- If I had to work this ground to control the weeds, there would be a lot more soil erosion.
- To help me reduce soil erosion, I use an airplane to spray this cropland because a ground sprayer is very difficult to use on this land.
- This way you could avoid the deep sands area and perhaps have to buy fewer rights of way?
- Physical issues (weed control, erosion).
- Land is idle and is native grass to minimize erosion and provide wildlife habitat.
- I am concerned that if E4 is shifted to cross this land causing construction on the land that it will take years for ground cover to reestablish.
- Alternate E4 in Kiowa County runs a mile north of the intersection of Cr33 and CrD. The half section (NE and SE) of section 17 within township 20S Range 49W is registered in CRP as this ground is considered highly erodible. It is native grass.
- Also cattle wubbing (sic) on the poles makes for no grass to grow and makes a blow-out area.
- Identification of quonset bin along F8 alt route as well as sand hills, sandy soils in Sections 3 and 4 T11S R55W. Map 9.
- Identification of farm and soil bank in Sections 12 and 13 T10S R41W under proposed B18. Map 37.
- Control soil erosion during and after construction, plans to work with land owners to revegetate disturbed areas.
- High moisture/ water on section 21 (wet lands). Muddy unstable clay soils.
- The proposed lines cross extremely fragile sand hills grass that has a north slope there by increasing wind erosion by prevailing north winds.

Soils

- The line coming to the Big Sandy substation on the north side of Hwy 287 is good because it is in heavier soil and less erodible. The line leaving Limon should stay North of I-70 going west of Limon because that is also heavier soil and less erodible from wind.
- The soil is very fragile along this route, Sandy soils. T3N R55W Sections 14 and 15.
- When I think of the damage that will be done by taking heavy equipment through, even one time, I know we will be dealing with the damage forever. The routes left by the wagon wheels on the Santa Fe Trail, are still visible to this day- and that wasn't done by heavy equipment!!
- We will be affected by this powerline no matter which route it takes. However, we would rather deal with the towers through the fields and the compaction problems that will go with it- in the fields, rather than in the native grass (where compaction will mean erosion.)

Soils

- The F8 alternate route in our area also would go over some of the highest unstable hills in this area, therefore wind and water erosion would be extremely hard to control if possible at all.
- The F8 alternate line south of the Big Sandy Creek is a very sandy and unstable route and if you were to use this route, I don't think you could ever control the erosion and wind damage you would create going across this land. I strongly suggest that you stay with the proposed F7 route due to the more stable [sic] ground conditions.
- As owner of a portion of the Sec. 3-T-11 R55, I am fully aware of the problems of soil erosion on this ground. We limit the amount of grazing to facilitate growing conditions.
- The alternative route from the Energy Center to Big Sandy follows a ridge of extremely sandy ground in the Hugo area.
- Extremely sandy soil, wind erosion- sand dunes.
- Our soil is very fragile how will cropland be protected from traffic so as to not damage productivity.
- I understand, as stated in the agreement, that you will be responsible for any damages to the property that my result from your core drillings, survey crews, environmental impacts assessments, etc. My concern is that if I grant access to the property that those individuals will be instructed to use reasonable judgment when performing their tasks. Not enter a field with a heavy truck when the fields are wet nor cross an intermittent stream or draw with the same. This action will typically create an erosion problem.
- This property (as your own map clearly show) is a wetland. It consists, for the most part, of wet, muddy, unstable clay soils year round as there is an underground spring which cuts the section in half from north to south. You point out in your own literature that water and high amounts of electricity don't mix.
- The ground along the F7 corridor around the Hugo Co vicinity is much more stable ground then along the F8 corridor. It will be much easier and accessible to run the line on the F7 corridor rather than the F8 corridor. The ground will be easier to reclaim the ground and easier to maintain an easement along the F7 corridor, rather than the F8 route.
- The F8 line south west of Hugo Co has extremely erodible ground. The ground is very sandy and will be extremely hard to reclaim if it is disturbed. While construction of the is going on the ground will blow with the wind and wash away very easily with rain. After construction the ground will be very difficult to reseed and grow good ground cover.
- The F8 route will require more towers be installed (south and west of Hugo) due to the topography of the ground which has severe elevation changes through the sand hills. The F7 route has much leveler topography (north and east of Hugo) which should require less towers.
- I think it would be impossible to reclaim it if it were disturbed.
- It's very erosive and the large blowout won't tolerate any activity we have worked for years to try and stabilize it and aren't successful.

Soils

- The F8 alternative route would go over our area and the sand and blowouts would be very unstable. It is very erosive soil and won't tolerate activity we don't even drive out there. We only use horse and undergraze it so it won't blow so bad.
- The F7 route would be a lot better soil to hold instead of the 7 8 alternatives which is very sandy soil with large blowouts. The erosion problem is very difficult now without disturbing if further.
- I strongly suggest the F7 route which has much more stable ground.
- Terraces will be built sometime soon.
- Hope you use the planned route (sic) the 2nd choice on route near Hugo as much of this land is very sandy & blows easily. Also near my home.
- We have contracted with NRCS to build terraces to control soil erosion on our land lord's property along the Kiowa county line road SE 1/4 34-20-44, SW 1/4 35-20-44, SW 1/4 34-20-44, and SE 1/4 33-20-44.
- We have built terraces on N1/2 27-21--43 to control soil erosion. The double sets of poles make maintenance of the terraces very difficult.
- Maintaining and building terraces contracted with the National Resources Conservation Service will be very difficult because of the large metal poles.
- Lesser prairie chicken habitat.
- As shown on the most recent printed map, the A1, A2, and A10 routes southwest of the Rolling Hills Substation should be avoided. This is an area that is critical to lesser prairie chickens.
- Wildlife observed on Native Grass in Northern Kearny County: Several variety of hawks, Many varieties of waterfowl, eagles, sandhill cranes, Western meadow larks, Western horned larks, lark buntings, loggerhead shrikes, common flicker, brown-headed cowbird, many different kinds of sparrows, mourning doves, western box turtles, several different types of snakes, lizards, fox, coyotes, mule deer, white tailed deer, pronghorn antelope, black tailed jack rabbit, cotton tail rabbit, striped skunk, badger, killdeer (plover), great blue heron, night heron, night hawk, different butterflies, bees, yellow headed blackbird, ringneck pheasant, great horned owl, short eared owl, screech owl, oriole, gold finch, juncos, kangaroo rat, American kestrel, falcons, bobwhite quail, turkey vulture, Wilson's phalarope, common snipe, sand pipers, longbilled curlew, American avocet, cattle egret, American coot, willet, frogs, toads, tiger salamander, gopher, 13-lined ground squirrel, Eastern and Western kind birds, Grackle, Red-winged Blackbird, Crow, Mockingbird, Thrasher, Mountain blue-bird, Barn swallows.
- At least two imperiled wildlife species are known to inhabit the Frost Livestock lands: the Mountain Plover and the Arkansas Darter.
- Frost Livestock lands contain native vegetation including cacti and grasses, riparian areas, wetlands and playa that provide habitat for numerous wildlife species, raptors and migratory birds.

Soils

- Our land where the proposed power lines would go has help establish an eco habitat for raptor birds and other wildlife species. Variety of owls and hawks (even the migratory raptors have been seen here, even an occasional bald eagle) are prolific throughout or 3000+ acres that we hunt upland game birds.

Vegetation

- Also concerned about damage to grass and reclamation and keeping cattle off for a couple of years.
- Don't want it though the grassland- prefer the farmground. Own both but concerned it would have a negative effect on cattle.
- Prefer that the line be on the West side of 22 Rd. on grassland not on farmland.
- Concerned about fragile sandhills pasture.
- The transmission line that ultimately goes to Lamar should not run through the sandsage grassland area (being restored to native vegetation by Wheatland Electric).
- Land is idle and is native grass to minimize erosion and provide wildlife habitat.
- Alternate E4 in Kiowa County runs a mile north of the intersection of Cr33 and CrD. The half section (NE and SE) of section 17 within township 20S Range 49W is registered in CRP as this ground is considered highly erodible. It is native grass.
- Gas line and grassland identified near proposed H4 on 2 Rd, Sections 15 and 22 in T1N R45W. Map 28.
- Identification of crop/grassland under alt. G5, Sec. 1 T9S R45W. Map 31.
- Control soil erosion during and after construction, plans to work with land owners to revegetate disturbed areas.
- Will static electricity effect vegetation growth during high moisture times, drought years?
- There is also less wildlife habitat in short grasses versus the taller sandhills grasses.
- Dave Sharman – 37 years with NRCS; interested in consulting regarding re-vegetation (970-842-0232); also interested in wind interconnection and Western's system.
- Max Engler – Prefers alternative to segments B5 and B7 through grass; drawn on Sheet 47.
- Dwight Rockwell – Contact Mobile Gas in Yuma regarding gas line in T1NR45W, Section 15; west side of road is grass; prefers H5 or easternmost alternative; Bittercreek Gas (?) T1SR44W.
- Hugh Scherrer: J1 is on a lot of grass, which would be better. Let me know if J3 becomes the proposed.
- Basically and routes that run south out of Holcomb will be either affecting existing habitat or proposed restoration areas.

Vegetation

- These two routes still unfortunately cross over some existing sandsage habitat, but not sure what can really be done about that.
- Attached is a map showing the proposed "southern" routes in relation to the property that Sunflower is proposing to restore to sandsage shrubland.
- There are at least 5 dams that I can think of offhand, on the draws through this native grass.
- Many times there are other wildlife on this grass. Once you establish a road or trail we can count on unwanted traffic through these areas. Not good for the grass, livestock, or the wildlife.
- We will be affected by this powerline no matter which route it takes. However, we would rather deal with the towers through the fields and the compaction problems that will go with it- in the fields, rather than in the native grass (where compaction will mean erosion.).
- Secondly, there is precious little native grass left in Northern Kearny County, and it is precious. Not only is this grass used by livestock, but also by the area's wildlife. They need a quiet and safe refuge.
- Most of this native grass is along the draws and more rough ground. Although some of it is flat enough to farms, these draws carry a great deal of water at times, and it is better that this land is in grass to help with erosion, both wind and water.
- Will static electricity effect [sic] vegetation growth during hi moisture times, drought years?
- Our property is in grass, and we've be very diligent in ensuring a good stand of grass.
- Prairie grasslands are a globally threatened habitat and one of the least protected ecosystems in the world.
- In addition, Frost Livestock has a rich history of outstanding land stewardship, conservation management and sustainable ranching practices. With more than half of our nation's grasslands having been replaced by human landscapes, the diversity of biological communities can only be protected if the remaining large expanses of land encompassing functional ecosystems are preserved.
- Frost Livestock lands contain native vegetation including cacti and grasses, riparian areas, wetlands and playa that provide habitat for numerous wildlife species, raptors and migratory birds.
- The Frost Livestock Ranch is located within the Central Shortgrass Prairie ecosystem, which is characterized by rolling plains and tablelands.
- The F8 line south west of Hugo Co has extremely erodible ground. The ground is very sandy and will be extremely hard to reclaim if it is disturbed. While construction of the is going on the ground will blow with the wind and wash away very easily with rain. After construction the ground will be very difficult to reseed and grow good ground cover.
- It would go in front of his house and obstruct his view. He prefers it be on the North/ East side of his house.

Vegetation

- Considering developing agro-tourism on property. Power lines would detract- visual quality.
- Highest point on our land. Most favorite spot on our land. Used for viewing.
- The C7 and C5 would be better for us. The line would still be on our land in several places. But not in our front view. That's very important to me.
- C6 & C2 running south of Burlington would not work for us. That line would be in my front window.
- My home, built in 1993, was positioned purposely for the south/southeast view of the Beaver Creek Valley. Large towers in that view would not be something we would desire. I am located east of Hwy 71 & South of County Rd. Q. Address is 29464 County Rd. Q, Brush. Thank you for your consideration here.
- B4 also obstructs our views and ruins the environment.
- I built my home specifically for the views that we have.

Visual

- What monetary compensation will be offered for loss of aesthetic value and possible loss of revenue generated by ag tourism?
- We live in western Cheyenne county because we enjoy the unobstructed view of the vast rolling prairie.
- The proposed transmission line from Limon to Lamar would destroy this unobstructed view. It would decrease the aesthetic value of the area in general as well as our own property.
- We have urban visitors that enjoy the same view; hunters, bird watchers, wildlife photographers, and people who like to experience working ranch activities.
- Decrease of aesthetic value.
- Prefer "dark skies"- downlighting lights at substations. Light what needs to be lighted only.
- Mainly concerned with decrease in property values IE views.
- This section is one of the few remaining areas of native land. The power lines would disrupt the natural beauty of the rolling hills GREATLY!
- People in Colorado with views of Pikes Peak have added value to their property simply because of the view. In Western Kansas, our valuable view is our sunsets. Putting these structures within one-two miles west of the residences destroys some of the value of the residence. Who wants to look at ugly metal towers silhouetted against a Kansas sunset?
- Don't want to look at this eyesoar [sic].
- It will destroy our view, ruin our property values, and create a serious health risk. This is not fair or reasonable.

Visual

- I enjoy my quiet. Power lines humm [sic], devalue property, and will mess up the beautiful sunrise.
- This now has views of the mountains, which will be diminished by the M4 route.
- I am asking to see the evaluation made as to environmental justice, land use- residential, economic values and visual resources as to the effect on my home site that are planned for the N 1/2, S-31, T-1N, R-63W.
- Primarily the visual impact of the power lines.
- Aside from the aesthetic and health concerns there are very real worries about the safety of our children during what promises to be a long drawn out construction process.
- If you increase the volume of the lines the sound will be louder and the view will be worse.
- One, they are on the high point of our subdivision and alter the view we have of Pikes Pike and the rest of the mountains to our west.
- He has enjoyed hiking this area for years and would not want a "large ugly" transmission line destroying the views. He is very concerned with the visual impacts.
- He is an avid hiker who enjoys hiking the Bohart more than nearly any place within reasonable distance from his home. His favorite hike is off of Meyer's Rd. Approximately 2 miles N. to the top of a hill where he finds a beautiful view of nearly pristine open country (looking to the west, in particular) with views of the Spanish Peaks, Culebra range, Sangre Cristo Range, and North to the Rampart Range.
- He stated that this is the only place he has found in El Paso County with the visual resources still largely intact, and unmarred by human encroachments and impacts.
- Mr. Edmundson would like the project to stay along existing transmission line corridors and not establish a new transmission line corridor on the Bohart-- and to especially avoid putting a line within sight of the particular hill he climbs.
- An additional power line is definitely in opposition to the character of Craig Ranch Bed & Breakfast, LLC & Horse Motel. Direct quotes from our website that do not agree with the proposed power line follows: "our passive solar home incorporates many windows, providing glorious, expansive views of the surrounding prairie".
- Should the line be built through the ranch, the completed line and construction phase will definitely take away from the ambiance of our view, tranquility, ranch tour, trail riding and guest cattle drives.
- An additional power line is definitely in opposition to the character of Craig Ranch Bed & Breakfast, LLC & Horse Motel. Direct quotes from our website that do not agree with the proposed power line follows: " Go with us in the pick up to check cattle, water, and fence. Bring your horse and enjoy horseback riding on our 15,000 acre ranch. Bring your camera and photograph wildlife."

Visual

- An additional power line is definitely in opposition to the character of Craig Ranch Bed & Breakfast, LLC & Horse Motel. Direct quotes from our website that do not agree with the proposed power line follows: "take in the expansive views, the prairie by day, the starlit sky by night."
- An additional power line is definitely in opposition to the character of Craig Ranch Bed & Breakfast, LLC & Horse Motel. Direct quotes from our website that do not agree with the proposed power line follows: "bring your horse and ride the range. You might opt to relax in the hammock, gaze at the stars, or wander to the garden and pick a bouquet."
- This was a beautiful country before all the powerlines came.
- Our view.
- I will retire within the next 2 years and I am concerned that it will interfere with my property and my view, as well as the value of the land.
- Further, upon investigation and consultation with a real estate expert and appraiser knowledgeable about real estate in Pueblo County, Colorado it is our position that health risk associated with the combined 1200 kilovolts of power as well as the noise and visible pollution created by the same would substantially damage the value if not make the Owl Canyon Property unmarketable.
- The presence of the J4 transmission line will impact one of the primary reasons we purchased the property, the beautiful view.
- We purchased this property with intent of a retirement home and one of the primary reasons for purchasing this particular property was the beautiful, unobstructed, view to the west.
- Our home is adjacent to Lincoln County Road 22 and has an unobstructed view to the west which includes the Pikes Peak Mountain Range.
- Objections to proposed Route J4 as shown on Sheet Map 9: Along the proposed Route J4 as it runs from Limon south to a point approximately 13 miles south of Limon, then turns southwesterly, crosses highway 71, and passes off of Sheet Map 9, it directly impacts at least 10 residences in terms of view and electrical interferences. That would not be as true of an alternative such as J1, since the pastureland is more sparsely settled.
- Noise and Visual pollution.
- Gregg Mullen – concerned about views from house to south; prefers eastern-most route alternative.
- Stewart Stabel – concern with views of segment B4 from house; built million dollar home; segment A6 okay.
- Ernest Hammer – routing questions in T15SR50W, Section 6; reroutes drawn on Sheet 20; concern with views; bird watcher, aesthetics; ranch sits high between Rush Creek and Big Sandy Creek; family is not happy.

Visual

- Does not agree with project – it isn't needed – he has enough power; build generation on front range and leave him alone; concern about farming around structures for the rest of his life; no amount of money can pay for that; wife discussed option of putting line on north side of existing line between Big Sandy and Burlington because of CRP land and absentee owners (noted on map) -- husband doesn't like that either because he would still have to look at it and doesn't think project is needed. Lee and Carey talked to extensively.
- I purchased this property in 1993, T10S, R56W, Sec 33, I have a view of Pikes Peak and the mountains that you will destroy with this line.
- Section 36 along segment M3. It is probably OK to split the state land. Concerned about the visual impacts from properties to the east.
- These lines are ugly.
- Alternate route K11 would have much less visual impact since it would parallel the existing Tri-State line.
- Our secondary concern is the location of Proposed Route K9, which would not only cross our property on a diagonal, but is sited to cross directly above our sole ranch entrance off Highway 71 at T5S/ R55W/ S6.
- Proposed Route N2: Big Sandy to 125-Mile: This 230 kV line would cross River Bend Ranch from east to west, starting at T8S/ R57W/ S30, and running west/southwest for five miles through T8S/ R58W/ S28. we accept the routing of this proposed route, as it avoids any conflict with our ranch operations and follows a direct line with minimal visual impact.
- If proposed route K9 is chosen then we would request a change in its route. Specifically we would suggest that it make its turn at T4S/ R55W/ S35 (three miles to the north of where proposed). This would allow both lines to cross the public road at the same place, reducing its visual impact, and in addition would avoid some of the rougher terrain encountered in Township 5S. There would also not be homes, farmsteads or driveways along a more northern route.
- This project is likely to impair scenic views both off and on Frost Livestock lands.
- The Frost Livestock lands also contain visually significant scenic corridors. The Spanish Peaks are clearly visible to the south and in every direction one can see the vast, open prairie reminiscent of the time before European settlement. The outstanding scenery in the area is very sensitive to impacts that could affect visual resources such as overhead electrical transmission lines.
- The contrasting views of mountains to the west and sweeping, open prairie to the east capture the allure of Colorado's varied landscapes and represent an important economic draw for the region. Protection of the views to and from the Frost Livestock Ranch benefits the public as well as the owners of the ranch.
- The towers that hold the power lines are unsightly and dangerous to raptors and migratory birds.
- It also crosses wetlands and one of the most picturesque meadows on the north fork of the smoky hill river on section 13-10S-40W.

Visual

- Why would you want to put a power line in this picture?
- I inherited a half section of my parents ranch. My mother and father worked their whole life to put the ranch together. I picked this parcel of ground because at one time it was the farthest from the house and I could lope a horse over there and see the Smith Ranch and Pikes Peak--- thinking how wonderful it was to be away from everything.
- I know the electric line would only take a few feet of ground but it ruins the concept of everything. I cannot look west and see Pikes Peak unobstructed or east and see the unending Smith Ranch. A two hundred foot easement will completely ruin the entire half section of my property.
- The line will impact the property value of not only the owner of the land beneath the line but also adjacent owners whose land values diminish because of diminished views, obviously this is subjective and EPTP can't reimburse everyone.
- More importantly, our concern is the loss of our "country atmosphere". We believe the substation and poles create a huge visual distraction.
- We have lived in this location for 10 years deciding on it in large part for it's views.
- Along the proposed Route J4 as it runs from Limon south to a point approximately 13 miles south of Limon, then turns southwesterly, crosses highway 71, and passes off of Sheet Map 9, it directly impacts at least 10 residences in terms of view and electrical interferences. That would not be as true of an alternative such as J1, since the pastureland is more sparsely settled.
- Visibility concerns: On the midway to Big Sandy route, proposed route J1 is the preferred route because it would not block views to the east from the Town of Limon or our house. For the Energy center to Big Sandy routes, proposed route F10 would be preferred because it would have the least visual impact from the Town of Limon and our house.
- East of our house and airport is a small valley. If the power lines could be placed at the bottom of that valley, rather than on the ridge lines, then the visual impact would be lessened.
- The two main concerns with the routes are safety concerns at the Limon airport and concern about the visibility of the power lines.
- Are there ways to construct the towers for the power lines that make them less visible? For example can they be painted so as to blend in with the surrounding country side?
- We live just north of Limon and west of the Limon airport. We can see the Big Sandy substation from our house. Accordingly the routes of interest and impact are the 1. Energy Center to Big Sandy Route, specifically F8, F9, & F10 and 2. Midway to Big Sandy Route, specifically J1, J2, J3, and J4. (See attachment for specific concerns).
- Part of the beauty of the eastern plains is the wide open, unobstructed views. We built our house to take advantage of those views. Every morning the sun rises in the east and we have a magnificent view of the sun rise. The same is true for full moons that crest pumpkin orange. Power lines to the east of our house would significantly impact those views.

Visual

- I am concerned about the potential health risks of proximity to high voltage, and possible aesthetic damage, both of which could negatively impact the use, enjoyment, and value of my land.
- If you both need towers in the same areas, will that end up doubling the number of towers and lines we have to view and make room for?
- We have always considered the quiet atmosphere and unobstructed view of our fields and the mountains to be a welcome tradeoff for distances we have to travel for services.
- Also having the high plains look as native as they can with just the houses. If I wanted to look at industry and city I would have moved to Denver.
- There is no doubt that this power line would have detrimental impacts on our health, the value of our land, and diminished re-sale values, not to mention the negative visual effects and electric interference with radio, television, etc.
- We very much enjoy the wonderful view of the Rocky Mountains from our front porch. I can honestly say obstructing the view with power lines, that could easily be placed elsewhere and be just as useful, would greatly damage my property value.
- I've lived in the Ellicott/Rush community all my life and my family and I chose to move to this specific location specifically because of the beautiful view.
- I'm positive that the exact same attributes (view) will be appealing to others when I finally subdivide my property and sell it for my retirement money.
- The Wray City water line diagonally across the land and it is marked. Be better if they contacted me or the city for location.
- Potential impacts to water sources (livestock) 200' clearance.
- Ground water runs in veins- would the foundations interfere with "cut off" water supply?
- What effect will T. line have on the metal water pipes that run from our place? Will I get shocked from hydrants?
- "Identified locations along the proposed F7 route including Section line, dam in seven mile creek, house, corrals, and steel shed in Sections 7 & 8 T11S R53W." Map 9.
- Identification of well with solar tank and Yaklich RI/TVI/AN ground clearance, and farm in Sections 18, 19, and 20 of T12S R57W. Map 10.
- "—Identification of two homesites in Sections 15 and 16 of T8S R49W just north of proposed G4 route.—Identification of solar water well in Sec. 16 T8S R49W under proposed G4 route." Map 22.
- Well identified under proposed E1 route, Sec. 9 T21S R45W. Map 26.
- Identification of water Assn Tank under alt. D4 in Sec. 3 T22S R43W. Map 36.
- Keep line back from existing stock water and stock water wells powered by wind or electricity.

Visual

- There are 3 irrigation wells and 1 domestic well immediately adjacent to the proposed L22 route of Big Sandy to Green Valley.
- High moisture/ water on section 21 (wet lands). Muddy unstable clay soils.

Water

- The city of Brush sent a letter following the initial scoping meetings on the city's well fields south of Brush. The wells tap a sand-filtered aquifer. The city would like the transmission lines to stay away from the well field.
- Dale Johnson – T14SR40W, Section 32; not in favor of line cutting across pasture; prefers alternative on south and west (this still surrounds him on 3 sides with existing line on east); pasture has well and was previously irrigated – still has water rights and could re-install pivot; 2 pivots on ½ section to south; consider going on south side so he isn't surrounded (owner is Dwayne Frasier); also concern with CRP compliance (has 1/8 mile of cedar trees). Also owns land north of Holly near Energy Center (T21SR41W, Section 6 and S ½ Section 1, T21SR42W) – no problem with line crossing here.
- Division of Wildlife, Wendy Figueroa: Arikaree River crossings and Republican River Crossings.
- Most of this native grass is along the draws and more rough ground. Although some of it is flat enough to farms, these draws carry a great deal of water at times, and it is better that this land is in grass to help with erosion, both wind and water.
- There are at least 5 dams that I can think of offhand, on the draws through this native grass.
- Sometimes we have an abundance of water and waterfowl on these ponds. I am concerned about any lines close to these areas.
- Please note that there are two draws (intermittent streams on the property).
- Also worried about EMF effects on pipelines (water and Gas).
- Frost Livestock lands contain native vegetation including cacti and grasses, riparian areas, wetlands and playa that provide habitat for numerous wildlife species, raptors and migratory birds.
- Domestic livestock grazing has been a traditional livelihood in El Paso and Pueblo counties since the late 1800s. The Frost and Hanna families have owned significant irrigated lands and water rights within the Fountain Creek watershed since the 1940s, a period now spanning four generations, making the ranch one of the most viable remaining ranching operations in the area.
- The proposed power lines would affect my irrigation, water rights, hunting preserve business and hay business. It would cost me money to move the center pivots that I have had at these locations for 5 years on my land.
- Yoder and Rush are developing communities. We have lots of children in our area, livestock, wells.

Water

- Our animals have no water when the electricity is interrupted, and we have to check all of the automatic waterers every time there is a power surge. Our farm sprinklers shut off every time there is a power surge. It is not that simple, short interruption of service that rights itself in a split second. There are major impacts whenever we lose power even if it is temporary.
- What is the setback distance of the line from farm homes, corrals, wells, etc.
- Ranches are longtime 'homesteaded' ranches. Less likely to subdivide in the future. Water in and around this corridor is limited. Hard to find. Limiting future growth.
- It will harbor insects and weeds. 21 W 1/2 19-50.
- Look for ways to facilitate movement of machinery around towers for controlling weeds or for farming.
- Don't have (sic) equipment to adequately control weeds w/ machinery- have to do it manually.

Weeds

- Weed barriers & gravel under towers?
- Pay for chemicals and labor costs.
- As a general rule I propose that you keep the structures 60' from roads and section lines so we can get machinery between the structure and the road/section line. This will help us control weeds and maneuver around the structures.
- If I had to work this ground to control the weeds, there would be a lot more soil erosion.
- I spray this cropland by airplane every year and usually several times a year to spray herbicides on this farmland to control weeds.
- This land is terraced and has areas of steep slopes making it very difficult to spray with a ground sprayer.
- Physical issues (weed control, erosion).
- He is concerned how he will be able to control weeds between the legs of the transmission towers since he can not use herbicides on his organic farm.
- Weeds grow under these structures.
- Hugh Scherrer: Aerial application is difficult. It is difficult to control weeds around these structures with aerial application, it must be done by hand. I have a 90-foot boom on my weed control applicator.
- Skip Crist- Relationship of the Towers and road or Section Line. Would like the structures further out from the section line so machinery can move around to farm and control weeks.

Weeds

- Would like the line to be located at least 60 feet in from the road so we can more easily maintain the area between the section line/road and the structures. Easier to control weeds. Equipment is 40-60 feet wide and we want to be able to maneuver completely around the structures.
- Hugh Scherrer: Noxious weeds are an issue around these lines. I can not get around the structures with equipment, must do it by hand.
- Weeds from construction, maintenance, etc. She will not allow the use of chemical control on her property.
- We cannot keep the weeds from growing around the poles and brace structure and the Tri State makes no attempt to spray, pull or eradicated the weeds as their right of way contract with me required.
- If they contacted me they would not have had to re survey and stake, but I still have the boxes to farm around and no one from the State or Mountain View takes care of the weeds growing around the boxes. In grassland cattle can graze around them and has very little impact.
- Who will take care of the ground under the towers weeds will grow & be a grasshopper haven.
- In addition, the placement of electrical transmission lines on the property will likely contribute to the spread of noxious weeds during construction and subsequent maintenance activities.
- As a landowner, farmer, tenant, and aerial application pilot I would like to see monopoles used as it makes weed control and all our operations easier.
- I would also like to address the continual problem of adopting changes in cultural practices especially fieldwork and spraying are a continual expense for the owner operators or tenant and really need to be considered as an ongoing expense long after the power line is completed. The operator will have to deal with the additional time and expense for perpetually.
- The lines would devalue the property would make it hard to farm and to be able to get all of the weeds cleared our so bugs would probably take over and damage crops.
- Double sets of poles on Road SS (N1/2) impacts our farm ground and ability to effectively spray and control weeds with our spray plane.
- We want single poles vs. towers that are projected because: farming easier around pole vs. tower, not as much waste and land needed for production to feed our county, weed control will be eliminated by you under a tower.
- Lesser prairie chicken habitat.
- Hawk nest on SE corner of property. What will high voltage do to a raptor nest? The line will not be in corridor.
- We have urban visitors that enjoy the same view; hunters, bird watchers, wildlife photographers, and people who like to experience working ranch activities.
- Will send species list for property.
- Deer, antelope, wild turkey population impacted on Bijan and Muddy Creeks.

Weeds

- Proposed route crosses wildlife dams- L-22.
- Wildlife pond for (sic) along Bijou Creek east in section 32.
- Comanche creek wildlife.
- In addition what effects will the transmission line have on the wildlife.
- Biological issues (wildlife habitat, wetlands).
- As shown on the most recent printed map, the A1, A2, and A10 routes southwest of the Rolling Hills Substation should be avoided. This is an area that is critical to lesser prairie chickens.
- Land is idle and is native grass to minimize erosion and provide wildlife habitat.
- Since we do not know what criteria, factors, or habitats are part of the "Potential Conservation Areas" we would encourage you to contact representatives from the Colorado Natural Heritage Program and get information on this area of their study in order to determine whether the proposed or alternative corridor has fewer constraints in the "Potential Conservation Area" be chosen as the preferred corridor.
- However we have some mixed feelings and concerns with the other proposed corridor in Eastern Arapahoe County. Our initial preference is for the L1 alternative corridor versus the L2 proposed corridor because it appears that there is more habitat area that may be disrupted than with the proposed corridor.
- He also expressed concern for the pronghorn herd and other wildlife that frequent the area.

Wildlife

- An additional power line is definitely in opposition to the character of Craig Ranch Bed & Breakfast, LLC & Horse Motel. Direct quotes from our website that do not agree with the proposed power line follows: "explore the ranch and perhaps you'll see the deer, antelope, turkey, coyotes, raccoons, and the variety of birds that migrate to our creek bottom."
- "—Section 23, 22 of T2S R61W proposed L15 on W side of road 246 because location of center pivot irrigation and a home site.\ —L9 and L15 redraw 1/2 mile south in Section 31 T2S R60W because of location of windmill for stock tank, wildlife pond, and hunting club." Map 2.
- Concerns: 1. The environmental impact on my property 2. The decrease in value 3. The on-going disruption and adverse effects on human, plant, and animal life.
- What is the impact on animals in the areas? Domesticated, farms, and wildlife animals.
- There is also less wildlife habitat in short grasses versus the taller sandhills grasses.
- Wendy Figureroa (CDOW) – asked question about phosphorescent bird flight diverters use in wetland/riparian areas; will send link to literature.

Wildlife

- Ernest Hammer – routing questions in T15SR50W, Section 6; reroutes drawn on Sheet 20; concern with views; bird watcher, aesthetics; ranch sits high between Rush Creek and Big Sandy Creek; family is not happy.
- Timothy Newton – why not use state land? Concern with effect on animals; how old is map? Decided project wouldn't affect his property.
- Division of Wildlife, Wendy Figueroa: Would like to see the project use phosphorescent markers to improve visibility in twilight—migratory bird protection from striking the line.
- These two routes still unfortunately cross over some existing sandsage habitat, but not sure what can really be done about that.
- Basically and routes that run south out of Holcomb will be either affecting existing habitat or proposed restoration areas.
- Many times there are other wildlife on this grass. Once you establish a road or trail we can count on unwanted traffic through these areas. Not good for the grass, livestock, or the wildlife.
- Secondly, there is precious little native grass left in Northern Kearny County, and it is precious. Not only is this grass used by livestock, but also by the area's wildlife. They need a quiet and safe refuge.
- Wildlife observed on Native Grass in Northern Kearny County: Several variety of hawks, Many varieties of waterfowl, eagles, sandhill cranes, Western meadow larks, Western horned larks, lark buntings, loggerhead shrikes, common flicker, brown-headed cowbird, many different kinds of sparrows, mourning doves, western box turtles, several different types of snakes, lizards, fox, coyotes, mule deer, white tailed deer, pronghorn antelope, black tailed jack rabbit, cotton tail rabbit, striped skunk, badger, killdeer (plover), great blue heron, night heron, night hawk, different butterflies, bees, yellow headed blackbird, ringneck pheasant, great horned owl, short eared owl, screech owl, oriole, gold finch, juncos, kangaroo rat, American kestrel, falcons, bobwhite quail, turkey vulture, Wilson's phalarope, common snipe, sand pipers, longbilled curlew, American avocet, cattle egret, American coot, willet, frogs, toads, tiger salamander, gopher, 13-lined ground squirrel, Eastern and Western kind birds, Grackle, Red-winged Blackbird, Crow, Mockingbird, Thrasher, Mountain blue-bird, Barn swallows.
- Sometimes we have an abundance of water and waterfowl on these ponds. I am concerned about any lines close to these areas.
- Frost Livestock lands contain native vegetation including cacti and grasses, riparian areas, wetlands and playa that provide habitat for numerous wildlife species, raptors and migratory birds.
- The towers that hold the power lines are unsightly and dangerous to raptors and migratory birds.
- Finally, additional power lines and related facilities will increase electromagnetic fields on the ranch, creating the potential for harm to wildlife, livestock and area residents.
- The proposed power lines contemplated by the Transmission Project will further fragment existing rangelands and wildlife habitat with access roads and construction impacts.

Wildlife

- Placing these on my land will be making it a danger to my clients to hunt in these areas due to hitting a power line with pellets or birds flying and getting tangled up in the power lines.
- Even your brochure states that wildlife habitat is your concern due to adverse impact on these animals.
- I have work hard to incorporate ranching and farming with hunting to create habitats that all animals can sustain and expand their populations.
- The five years + that we have been in business has helped establish additional habitat for the raptor birds, the native sparrow hawks, owls and other wildlife that is on our land.
- Our land where the proposed power lines would go has help establish an eco habitat for raptor birds and other wildlife species. Variety of owls and hawks (even the migratory raptors have been seen here, even an occasional bald eagle) are prolific throughout or 3000+ acres that we hunt upland game birds.
- I would have to ask the US fish and wildlife service to come out and do a study of the damage to the eco system if this power line is put on my land.
- The hunting preserve has generated an eco habitat for raptor birds, a variety of owls and hawks have been increasing due to upland birds that survive and the native upland birds that are beginning to populate our land, this creates an environment that allows the predatory birds to grow in numbers.
- This would affect herds of antelope, deer, and elk as well as the geese and ducks that land on our irrigated land and watering holes. All of these animals are more concentrated around the center pivots due to the water and feed availability.
- All of the predatory birds are protected by the US fish and wildlife service and these powerlines could cause a severe decline in their numbers when affecting our hunting preserve.
- Five major lines in a four mile corridor will have a negative impact on these birds as this is a major feeding area for them.
- The area north of Bristol is a major flyway and wintering are for snow geese, greater Canadian Geese, duck, cranes, eagles, hawks and falcons, and many smaller birds.